

THE 7
BLOODY TENENT,

WASHED,
And made white in the blood of the
Lambe: being discusſed and diſcharged of
blood-guiltineſſe by juſt Defence.

WHEREIN

The great Questions of this preſent time are
handled, *viz.* How farre Liberty of Conſcience
ought to be given to thoſe that truly feare God? And how farre
reſtrained to turbulent and peſtilent perſons, that not one-
ly raze the foundation of Godlineſſe, but diſturb the Civill
Peace where they live? Alſo how farre the Magiſtrate may pro-
ceed in the duties of the firſt Table? And that all Magiſtrates
ought to ſtudy the word and will of God, that they may frame
their Government according to it.

DISCUSSED.

As they are alledged from divers Scriptures, out of
the Old and New Teſtament. Wherein alſo the praſtiſe of
Princes is debated, together with the Judgement of An-
cient and late Writers of moſt precious eſteeme.

Whereunto is added a Reply to Mr. WILLIAMS
Answer, to Mr. COTTONS Letter.

BY JOHN COTTON Batchelor in Divinity, and
Teacher of the Church of Chriſt at Boſton in New-England.

may 15th LONDON,
Printed by Matthew Symmons for Hannab Allen, at the Crowne in
Popes-Head-Alley. 1647.

THE BLOODY TENT.

WASHERD.
And made white in the blood of the
Lamb: being dulled and discharged of
blood-guiltiness by just Defence.

WHEREIN

The great Question of this present time are
handled, viz. How farre Liberty of Conscience
ought to be given to those who deny the God? And how farre
restrained to such as are not? And how farre
lyt the restriction of Conscience, but disturb the Civil
Peace where they live? And how farre the Magistrate may pro-
ceed in the duties of the first Table? And what all Magistrates
ought to study the word and will of God, that they may frame
their Government according to it.

DISCUSSED.

As they are alleged from divers Scriptures, out of
the Old and New Testament. Wherein also the practice of
Princes is debated, together with the Judgment of An-
cient and late Writers of most precious esteem.

Whereunto is added a Reply to Mr. WILLIAMS
Answer, to Mr. COTTON'S Letter.

BY JOHN COTTON Bachelor in Divinity, and
Teacher of the Church of Christ at Boston in New-England.

LONDON,
Printed by Matthew Sparrow for Humble Allen, at the Crown in
Popes Head-Alley. 1647.



THE
BLOODY TENET
WASHED AND MADE
WHITE IN THE BLOOD
OF THE LAMBE.

OR
The Bloody Tenet discust and
discharg'd of blood-guiltinesse, by
Just defence.

CHAP. I.



THE *Bloody Tenet* (I mean the booke stiled by that name, tending to discusse an holy & wholesome truth, of God Manderously stiled the *Bloody Tenet*) was put forth against the Royall Law of the love of the Gospel. *Mr. Williams* sent me about a dozen yeares agoe (as I remember) a letter, penned (as he wrote) by a Prisoner in *Newgate*, touching perfection for Conscience sake: and in-
treated

treated my judgement of it for the satisfaction of his friend. I was not willing to deny him any office of Christian love, and gave him my poore judgement in a private letter. This private letter of mine he hath published in Print after so many yeares, and there with a Refutation of it. If my letter was Orthodoxall and tending to satisfaction, and edification, why did he refute it? If corrupt and erroneous (specially if bloudy) why did he publish it?

The letter, and so the error contained in it, (if it was an error) it was private, and so private, that I know no man that hath a copy of it, no not my selfe who penned it (for ought I could find) but himselfe onely, if I did offend him by the writing of such an error to him (though by himselfe intreated to expresse my judgement) let him remember, he pleaderh for libertie of conscience: I wrote my conscience and the truth of God according to my conscience, in the sight of God. Why should he punish me with open penance, and expose me (as much as in him lieth, before the world) to open shame, as a man of bloud, for the liberty of my conscience? How will it stand with his owne principles, to plead for liberty of conscience and yet to punish it? Besides let him remember, if I did offend him with such an error, it was but a private offence, and the rule of the Gospel required, he should first have convinced and admonished me privately of it, and so have proceeded upon my contumacy, at length to have told the Church, before he had published it to the world. But such as seeke for new Apostles, must seeke also for new Gospel, before this manner of dealing can be justified, by the Gospel of Christ. That booke of his therefore being thus begun against the rule of the Gospel, no marvell if it swarve from the truth of the Gospel all a long. He that setteth forth out of his way in the first entrance of his journey, no marvell if he wander all the day after.

CHAP. 2.

Of the title he prefixeth to my answer of the prisoners letter.

IN printing my answer to the prisoners Letter, he prefixeth this title *The answer of Mr. John Cotton of Boston in New-England* professeth

professedly maintaining Persecution for cause of Conscience.

This Title trespasseth not onely against the Creator of Christian love, which is wont to take even doubtfull things in the fairest sense: but even against the Law of truth. For in the whole purport of my Answer to the Letter, both in stating the Question, and in answering Objections, I expressly professe, 1. *That no man is to be persecuted at all (much lesse for Conscience sake :) because all persecution is oppression for Righteousnesse sake.* 2. I Professe further, *That none is to be punish'd for his Conscience sake, though Erroneous, unlesse his Errors be Fundamentall, or seditiously, and turbulently promoted, and that after due conviction of Conscience: That it may appeare, he is not punished for his Conscience, but for sinning against his Conscience.*

Thus while he pleadeth for Liberty of Conscience, he taketh Liberty to his Conscience openly to publish, That I do professedly maintaine Persecution for cause of Conscience, When I doe in expresse tearmes professedly Renounce it. This Liberty of Conscience setteth the Conscience at Liberty *Calumniandi audacter.*

Object. But it may be, by consequence, I doe maintaine Persecution for cause of Conscience, though in expresse tearmes I professedly Renounce it.

Ans. 1. What if such a thing might be inferr'd by consequence? mens judgements and professions are not to be taken up from every unwary consequence, against their owne positive and expresse Declarations, and Professions. It is iustly taxed in *Bellarmino* as a slanderous Calumny, that he bringeth in *Luther, Calvine, Martyr Bucer*, makeing God the Authour of sinne, which all of them in expresse tearmes doe auoyde; yet he would fasten such a blasphemous Tenet upon them (forsooth) by consequences. In like sort by the like consequences is the *Bloudy Tenet* fastened upon me. When the eyes are bloud-shotten, or looke through a red glasse, all things about them will appeare red and bloody. But if this Tenet have any appearance of blood in it, It is because it is washed in the Bloud of the *Lambe*, and sealed with his blood. And then though it may seeme Bloudy to men of corrupt mindes destitute of the truth, (as *Paul* seemed to such to be a Pestilent fellow) yet to faithful and upright soules, such things as are washed in the Bloud of the *Lambe*, are wont to come forth white, as did the followers of the *Lambe*, who washed their Robes white in the Bloud of the *Lambe*, *Rev* 7. 14.

C H A P. 3.

*A reply to the third Chapter of the Bloudy Tenet discusst,
what is a cause of Conscience in generall.*

IN stating of the Question I propounded some distinctions for clearing of the Point. The 1. was this in mine Answer to the Letter of the Prisoner.

By Persecution for cause of Conscience, I conceive you meane, either for professing some point of Doctrine, which you beleive in Conscience to be the Truth: or for practising some worke, which you beleive in Conscience to be a Religious duty.

Discusser.

This distinction is not full and compleate. For besides both these, a man may be persecuted for cause of Conscience, because he dare not be constrained to yeild obedience to such Doctrines and worships, as are by men Invented, and Appointed; As the three famous Jewes were cast into the fiery Furnace (in a non-conformity to the whole conforming world) before the Golden Image, Dan. 3. 21. &c.

Defender.

Thus a man may find a knot in a Bulrush, yea thus a man that were disposed might find fault with the Comforts of God for not being full and Compleate: with the Affirmative Comforts, because they doe not expresse the Negative; and with the Negative, because they doe not expresse the Affirmative. He that maketh it persecution for cause of Conscience, when a man is punished for professing such Doctrine, which he beleiveth in Conscience to be the truth, he maketh it (a Pari) Persecution for cause of Conscience, when a man is punished for Renouncing such Doctrines, which he beleiveth in Conscience to be Erroneous. And he that maketh it Persecution for cause of Conscience, when a man is punished for practising such a worke, which he beleives in conscience to be a Religious duty, He maketh it no lesse Persecution for cause of Conscience, when a man is punished for not practising such a worke, which he beleiveth in Conscience to be a sin.

C H A P. 4.

A Reply to his fourth Chapter touching the distinction of Doctrines, Some fundamentall, others circumstantiall, and lesse Principall.

IN points of Doctrine (I said in my Answer to the Prisoners Letter) Some are Fundamentall, without right beleife whereof, a man cannot be saved: others are circumstantiall, and lesse Principall, wherein one man may differ from another in judgement, without prejudice of salvation on either part,

Discusser.

To this distinction (He saith) Truth dare not subscribe, for then thousands ten thousands should everlastingly be condemned, yea the whole Generation of the Righteous, who since the falling away, have and doe erre fundamentally concerning the true matter, Constitution, Gathering, Governing of the Church. And yet farre be it from any pious Breast, to Imagine that they are not saved &c.

Defender.

Fundamentall Doctrines are of two sorts: Some hold forth the foundation of Christian Religion, as the Doctrines of salvation by Christ, and of faith in his Name, Repentance from dead workes, Resurrection from the dead; and the like. Others concerne the Foundation of the Church, as the matter and forme of it, and the proper Adjuncts accompaning the same: The Apostle speaketh of both these sorts of Foundations together, Heb. 6. 1. 2.

I speake of the former sort of these onely, namely the Foundation, or fundamentall points of Christian Religion, which who so subverteth, and Renounceth, he renounceth also his owne salvation. The other sort I looke at as lesse principall, in comparison of these, though some of them have a fundamentall vse in Church order. It was pertinent to the Question propounded in the Prisoners Letter, to expresse how farre I allowed Toleration even in such fundamentall Errors, as subverted the Foundation of Christian

Christian Religion. And in other Errors lesse dangerous, such as neither subverted Religion, nor Salvation, It would easily be conceived, that Toleration, might more easily be allowed.

How farre *New English Churches* partake with the *Old English Parish Churches* in any of the Ordinances of God, and upon what ground, hath been declared in the Reply to the Answer of the other Letter. Where also it hath been cleared, how farre off the Churches here have been from persecuting, or oppressing any of their Brethren for presenting light to them about this point: which may prevent and still the lamentation of peace, in the beginning of this fifth Chapter.

C H A P. 5.

A Reply to his fifth Chapter Concerning a distinction of Points of Practise.

IN Answer to the Prisoners Letter, I said in points of Practise, some concerne the weightier Duties of the Law, as what God we worship, and with what kinde of Worship: whether it be such, as if it be right, Fellowship with God is held: If false, Fellowship with God is lost.

Discuffer.

It is worth the Inquiry, what kinde of worship be intended, whether in generall acceptation the Rightnesse or Corruptnesse of the Church, or the Ministry of the Church, or the Ministrations of the Word, Prayer Seales &c.?

And because it pleaseth the Spirit of God to make the Ministry one of the foundations of Christian Religion (Heb. 6. 1. 2.) and also to make the Ministry of the Word and Prayer, in the Church, to be two speciall workes (even of the Apostles themselves, Acts 6. 2.) I shall desire, it may well be considered in the feare of God.

1. Concerning the Ministry of the Word, If their new Ministry, and ordination be true, then the former was false: And if false, then will it not follow according to this distinction, that fellowship with God was lost?

2. Concerning

2. Concerning Prayer, the New English Ministers have disclaimed and written against that Worship of God by Common or set formes of Prayer, which yet themselves practised in England.

And though they were faithfully admonished for using the Common Prayer, yet at that time they satisfied their hearts with the practise of the Author of the Councell of Trent &c. But now I aske, whether or no, fellowship with God in such Prayers was lost? &c.

3. Gods People may live and die in such kinds of worship notwithstanding light presented to them able to convince yet not reaching to a conviction, and to forsakeing of such wayes, which is Contrary to his Conclusion, That Fundamentalls are so cleare, th it a man cannot but be convinced in Conscience after once or twice Admonition: And therefore such a person not being convinced, he is condemned of himselfe, and may be persecuted for sinning against his Conscience.

4. I Observe here that Mr. Cotton herein measureth to others, that which himselfe when he lived in such practises, would not have had measured to himselfe. As 1. That it might have been affirmed of him, that in such practises he did sin against his Conscience, having sufficient light shinning about him. 2. That he should or might have been cut off by death, or Banishment, as an Hereticke sinning against his Conscience, &c.

Defender.

1. It needs no inquiry what worship I meane, whether Church and Minister, or Ministrations of the Word, Prayer, Seales &c. For I meane none of these, as they are dispenced in the Churches of England. Though there have been corruptions in the order and dispensations of these things amongst them, (especially in the times when we lived there) yet neither their Churches, nor Ministry, nor Ministrations were such, or so false that fellowship with God could not be held of them, not onely inwardly and secretly, but also outwardly and visibly: not onely in inward conversion and conviction, but also in outward and visible Reformation according to light received. Take my words as I wrote them, and as he relateth them, and my meaning is plaine enough: I speake of such worship, which if false, fellowship with God is lost: which cannot truly be avouched of any part of the Worship of God in England.

Ier. 31. 34.

It is not truly said, that the Spirit of God maketh the Ministry one of the Foundations of Christian Religion, *Heb. 6. 1. 2.* for it is onely a foundation of Church Order, not of faith, or Religion, the Apostle puts an expresse difference between faith, and Church Order, *Colos. 2. 5.* Nor is it a true and safe speech, to call the Fellowship or blessing of God vouchsafed to corrupt Churches, or Ministers, or Ministrations *to call it, I say, unpromised, or to be beyond a word, or promise of God.* For it is a large and yet an expresse promise of the Covenant of Grace, that God will be mercifull to our iniquities, That he will be mercifull to every one that prepar-eth his heart to seeke God, though he be not cleansed according to the Purification of the Sanctuary, *2 Chron. 30. 18, 19, 20.* with many more such like. And therefore there wants not Promises of Grace and blessing to the People of God, notwithstanding some defects and impurities found in their Administrations. Neither will it follow, *that if our Ministry, and Ordination here be true, that then the former which we had in England was false, especially so false, as that according to visible Rule, Fellowship with God was lost.*

For the Rite of Ordination we doe not looke at it as any Essenti-
all Part of our vocation to the Ministry, no more then Coronation
is an Essenti-
all Part of the Office of the King. And though we doe
not justly sundry things found in our Ministry, yet *Jehoshuah* the
High Priest did not loose his Fellowship with God, though he
was cloathed with filthy Garments, *Zach. 3. 3, 4.*

2. Concerning Prayer, though the *New English* Ministers have
witnessed against the Common set-Forme thereof, which yet our
selves in our ignorance have sometimes used, and have therefore
seen just cause to judge our selves since: yet we did not thereby
loose fellowship with God by such sinnes of Ignorance, no more
then the People of God did in the dayes of *Hezekiah*, by sacrific-
ing to God in the High places, when yet they did it to the Lord
their God onely, *2 Chron. 33. 17.*

I know no such faithfull Admonishers, as presented to us in
England, Arguments against the Common Prayer, which then seemed
weake, but now are acknowledged to be sound, though such a thing pos-
sibly may be true, howsoever forgotten. But this I am perswaded to be ut-
terly false, that any of us satisfied our hearts with the Practise of the
Author of the Councell of Trent, who used to read some of the choys-
est

select Prayers out of the Mass-Booke. The Spirit of a childe of God, though upon occasion he may receive such a Practise, yet he can never satisfie himselfe with the Practise of any godly man for the warrant of his Imitation without some further light (or at least apprehension of light) from the word.

3. It is readily granted, (that which is observed in the third place) That Gods people may live and die in such kindes of Worship, though light from the Word, whether publickly or privately hath been presented to them able to convince.

Neverthelesse, that will not weaken the Conclusion (formerly mentioned, and afterwards further discussed) That Fundamentalls are so cleare, that a man cannot but be convinced in Conscience of the Truth of them after two or three Admonitions: and that therefore such a Person as still continueth obstinate, is condemned of himselfe: and if he then be punished, He is not punished for his Conscience, but for sinning against his owne Conscience. For both these may well stand together, and are farre of from crossing or contrarying one another. A set forme of Prayer, though it be unlawfull, yet it is not such a Fundamentall Error either in judgement or practise, as cutteth off from fellowship with God: That is onely a resolute Assertion of the *Discusser*, but avouched without all colour or pretence from the Scripture. There is some resemblance and proportion betweene Praying and Propheying; *Moses* used an unwarranted way and Forme of Propheying, when God Commaunding him to speake to the Rock before the Congregation of *Israel*, He spake not to the Rock, but stroke it with his Rod, (for which he had no Commaundement) and spake to the People and that in a Passion (and both without a Commaundement) *Numb.* 20. 8. 11. And yet this did not cutt off his Fellowship with God, nor Gods gracious Presence with him in giving water to the People, no not at that time, God knoweth how to be present with his People, in blessing their Administrations, and forgiving their iniquities, though he doe take vengeance of their Inventions, *Psal.* 99. 8.

4. Though I doe maintaine (as the Apostle doth) a Clearnesse of Fundamentall Points of Religion and Worship (such Fundamentalls I say, without which, Fellowship with God cannot be had) and though I graunt, that in subverting such Fundamentall Points, and persisting therein after once or twice Admonition, a

man sinneth against his owne Conscience, and is therefore censurable by the Church, yea and by the Civill Magistrate also, if after Conviction he continue to seduce others unto his Damnable Heresie; yet I doe not herein measure to others, that which my self, when I lived in such practises, would not have measured to my selfe.

For I thank God, God never left me to live in any such Practises, as to fall into any Fundamentall Error, much lesse to Persist therein after Conviction and Admonition, and least of all to seduce others therinto. If God should leave me so farre, as to fall so fearefully into this three-fold degree of Hereticall wickednesse, what am I better then other men? better my selfe cut off by death, or Banishment, then the Flock of Christ to be seduced and destroyed by my Hereticall wickednesse.

CHAP. 6.

A Reply to his sixth Chapter Discussing Civill peace, and the Disturbance of it.

IN this Chapter, the Discussor undertaketh to declare what Civill peace is, and to shew, that the Toleration of different Religions, is no Disturbance of Civill Peace.

First, for Civill peace, what is it, saith he, but *Pax Civitatis*, whether English, or Irish, Spanish or Turkish City.

Reply.

Be it so, and if the Civill State, or Common-wealth containe many Citties, or Townes, and so become a whole Countrey or Common-wealth, let Civill Peace be the peace of the Countrey, or of the Common-wealth. But what is then the peace of the City, or Countrey? Is it not *Tranquillitas Ordinis* the tranquillity of order in every Society, wherein the Publicke Weale of the City, or Countrey is concerned? And is it not the proper worke of the Civill Magistrate to preserve the Civill Peace, and to prevent or reforme the disturbance of the Tranquillity or Peace of any such Societies, in whose Peace, the Peace or Weale of the City or Society is concerned? Suppose a Society of Merchants or Cloath-

yers,

yers, or Fishmongers, or Drapers, or the like: If the Weale of the Citty or Countrey be concerned in these, (as it is much concerned in them all): It is not for the safety of the Civill Sate to suffer any of these so to be disturbed, as wholly to breake up, and to be dissolved.

No matter (saith the Discusser) though they doe wholly breake up into peices and dissolve into nothing. For neverthelesse the Peace of the Citty is not thereby in the least measure impaired or disturbed: because the Essence or being of the Citty is Essentially distinct from those particular Societies &c. The Citty was before them, and standeth absolute and Entire, when they are taken downe &c.

Reply.

If by Peace be meant (as in Scripture Language it is) all welfare, It would argue a man that liveth in the world, to be too much Ignorant of the state of the world, to say that in the breaking up and dissolving of such perticular Societies, the Peace of the Citty or Countrey is not in the least measure impaired, or disturbed.

For 1. Though such Societies of Merchants and other Trades, be not of the Essence of the Citty; yet they be of the integrity of the Citty. And if the defect of one Tribe in *Israel* was a great trouble to all the Common-wealth of *Israel* (*Judges*, 21. 2, 3.) then sure the breaking up and dissolving of so many particular usefull Societies cannot but much impaire and disturbe the Peace and wellfare of the Citty and Countrie.

2. Though these Societies of Trades be not of the Essence of the Citty, yet they are amongst the conservant causes of the Citty: as without which the Citty cannot long flourish, no nor well subsist. Common sense will acknowledge so much.

Now then if all these particular Societies and severall Companies of Trades, they and their peace and wellfare doe much concerne the wellfare and peace of the Citty and Countrey, and therefore it behooveth the Civill Government to provide for their peace and wellfare: I demand, whether the Church also, (which is a particular Society of Christians) whether, I say, the Peace and wellfare of it, doe not concerne the Peace and wellfare of the Citty or Countrey where they live?

If it be denyed it is Easily proved:

First, *David* saith they shall prosper that love the Peace of *Jerusalem*, and seeke the good of it; *Psal.* 122. 6. &c. And *Solomon* saith, where the Righteous rejoyce there is great Glory, *Pro.* 28. 12. And what is the Church, but a Congregation of Righteous men? If the Rejoycing of the Church be the glory of a Nation, surely the disturbing, and distracting, and dissolving of the Church, is the shame and Confusion of a Nation.

2. Consider the Excellency and Preheminence of the Church above all other Societies. *She is the fairest amongst women*, *Cant.* 1. 8. and 6. 1. *She is the Citty and House of God*, *Revel.* 21. 2. *Psal.* 48. 1. 1. *Tim.* 3. 15. The world and all the Societies of it, are for the Church, 1 *Cor.* 3. 21, 22. The world would not subsist, but for the Church: nor any Countrey in the world, but for the service of the Church. And can the Church then breake up, into peices, and dissolve into nothing, and yet the Peace and welfare of the Citty, not in the least measure impaired or disturbed?

3. It is a matter of just displeasure to God, and sad greife of heart to the Church, when Civill States looke at the estate of the Church, as of little, or no concernment to themselves. *Zach.* 1. 15. *Lament.* 1. 12.

Object 1. Many glorious and flourishing Cittyes of the world maintaine their Civill Peace: yea the very Americans, and wildest Pagans, keep the Peace of their Townes, and Cittyes, though neither in the one, nor in the other can any man prove a true Church of God in these places.

Ans. It is true, where the Church is not, Cittyes and Townes may enjoy some measure of Civill Peace, yea and flourish in outward prosperity for a time, through the Patience and Bounty and Long-sufferance of God. *The times of Ignorance God winketh at* *Act.* 17. 30. But when the Church cometh to be Planted amongst them, If then Civill States doe neglect them, & suffer the Churches to corrupt, and annoy themselves by pollutions in Religion, the staffe of the Peace of the Common-wealth will soone be broken, as the Purity of Religion is broken in the Churches. The Common-wealth of *Rome* flourished five hundred yeares before the Kingdome of God in his Church came amongst them: and the decayes of the Common-wealth occasioned by the persecutions of the Church, were Repaired by the Publick establishment of the

the Churches peace in Christian Emperors. But when the Churches begun to pollute themselves by the Idolatrous worship of Images, and the Christian Emperors tooke no care to reforme this abuse in Churches, the Lord sent in (amongst other barbarous nations) the *Turkes* to punish, not onely degenerate Churches, but also the Civill State for this wickednesse. And therefore the Holy Ghost upbraideh them for their continuance in Image worship, though the *Turke* were let loose from the River *Euphrates*, to scourge them for it, *Rev. 9. 14. 20.* Goe now, and say, the estate of the Church whether true, or false, (pure or corrupt) doth not concerne the Civill Peace of the Sate.

Object. 2. The Peace of the Church (whether true or false) is spirituall, and so of an higher and farre different nature from the peace of the Countrey, or People, which is meerey and Essentially Civill and humane.

Ans. 1. Though the inward peace of the Church be spirituall and heavenly: yet there is an outward peace of the Church due to them (even from Princes and Magistrates) in a way of godlinesse and honesty, *1. Tim. 2. 1. 2.* But in a way of ungodlinesse, and Idolatry, it is an wholesome faithfulnessse to the Church if Princes trouble the outward peace of the Church, that so the Church finding themselves wounded and pricked in the house of their friends, they may repent, and returne to their first Husband, *Zach. 13. 6. Hosea. 2. 6. 7.*

Ans. 2. Though the peace of the Countrey or Common-wealth be Civill and humane, yet it is distracted and cutt off, by disturbing the spirituall purity, and peace of the Church. *Jehu* cutting short his Reformation, God cutt short the coasts of the Civill State. *2 King. 10. 31. 32.*

Ans. 3. Civill Peace (to speake properly) is not onely a peace in civill things, for the Object; but a peace of all the persons of the Citty, for the Subject. The Church is one Society in the Citty, as well as is the Society, of Merchants, or Drapers, Fishmongers, and Haberdashers, and if it be a part of Civill Justice, out of regard to Civill Peace, to prote& all other Societies in peace according to the wholesome Ordinances of their Company, is it not so, much more to prote& the Church-Society in peace, according to the wholesome Ordinances of the Word of Christ?

C H A P. 7.

A Reply to his seventh Chapter : Discussing what it is to hold forth a Doctrine or Practise in an Arrogant and impetuous way tending of it selfe to the disturbance of the Civill Peace.

HERE 2. Things he complaineth of, 1. That I have not declared what this Arrogant and impetuous way is : 2. That he cannot but expresse his sad and sorrowfull observation, how it pleaseth God to leave me, to take up the Common Reproachfull Accusation of the Accuser of Gods Children, That they are arrogant and impetuous.

Defender

I did not thinke it needfull to declare what an Arrogant and Impetuous way was, seeing his Request was, not that I should compile a discourse of mine owne : but that I should returne an Answer to the Letter of his friend. And it is an Answerers part not to Expatiate into declarations, but distinctly and closely to remove Objections. Besides himselfe is not ignorant of this point, nor needeth to be taught, what an Arrogant, and impetuous way is. For he himselfe telleth us (in his 8th Chapter) *That the Civill Peace may be broken by holding forth a Doctrine or practise, with rayling or reviling, daring or challenging speeches (which is a way of Arrogancy :) or with force of Armes, Swords, Gunns &c.; which is a way of Impetuoufnesse.*

But if it be desired that I should declare my self herein, thus briefly take it. He holdeth forth an erroneous Doctrine, or Practise, in an Arrogant and Impetuous way, not onely who carrieth it in a reviling and daring way (which is a disturbance to Civill Peace :) But also he who refuseth to subiect his spirit to the spirit of the Prophets in a holy Church of Christ (contrary to 1 Cor. 14. 32.) which is a disturbance to the peace of the Church. And withall, he that shall oppose such as dissent from his Errors, either by violent meanes (as the Circumcellians did by Clubbs, and Swords, and as

Zedekiah

Zedekiah did Micajah with Fists, 1 Kings, 22. 24.) or by censorious reproaches, and by rejecting Communion with them even before conviction, or admonition, all these are wayes of Arrogance, and Impetuouſnesse, and tend to the disturbance either of civill, or of Church Peace, or of both.

But for the 2. His sad and sorrowfull Observation, that God hath left me to take up the common reproachful Accuſation of the Children of God, as if they were Arrogant, and Impetuous in their way, upon what ground the *Diſcuſſer* taketh this up, I confeſſe I cannot Imagine, unleſſe,

Conſcius ipſe ſibi, de ſe putat omnia dici.

There is not the leaſt jot or tittle in my Letter, that applyeth this Accuſation of Arrogance, or impetuouſnesse to any of the Children of God at all. Nor had I the leaſt thought of himſelfe, when I wrote that Letter, who (for ought I can remember) did then keepe communion with all his Brethren, and held loving acquaintance with my ſelfe.

As for theſe fix Caſes he ſpeaketh of (or rather, wayes) wherein the Children of God have oppoſed the ſtreame of the times, and have there upon been taxed as Arrogant and impetuous Troublers of the State, & yet were none ſuch, I willingly allow them to ſtand good, ſave onely they might as well be reduced to 2. or 3. Heads, as branched out into 6. But howſoever, they are nothing pertinent to the Point in hand: none of them being wayes of Arrogancy, nor Impetuouſnesse, but of well Ordered, and Chriſtian faithfullneſſe, and Magnanimity. If any of them did put forth acts of Impetuous violence, (as *Elijah* did in putting the Prophets of *Baal* to death 1 King. 18. 40.) It was done by vertue of an extraordinary calling, or elſe by the conſent of the King and people then preſent.

Befides as none of the fix wayes wherein the Meſſengers of God walked againſt the ſtreame of the times, were wayes of Arrogance, and impetuouſnesse, ſo much leſſe were theſe holy men of God Impetuous, in holding forth any Error, or evill praſtiſe, which is the Point in hand.

C H A P. 8.

Some what more of holding forth Error in a way of Arrogance, and Impetuousnesse.

Discusser.

The Distinction now in Discussion concerneth not Truth and Error, but the manner of holding forth, or divulging.

Defender.

The distinction doth expressly speake of holding forth things Erroneous and unlawfull, either in a meeke and peaceable way, or with such Arrogance and Impetuousnesse, as tendeth and reacheth (even of it selfe) to the disturbance of Civill Peace. And therefore it cannot be said with truth, that the distinction concerneth not Truth and Error; The distinction expressly concerneth both the sinfull matter held forth [things erroneous and unlawfull] and the sinfull manner of holding them forth, with such Arrogance and impetuousnesse, as tendeth to the disturbance of Civill Peace.

Discusser.

I Acknowledge such may be the way, and manner of holding forth (either with railing or reviling, daring or challenging, speeches, or with force of Armes, Swords, Gunns, Prisons &c.) that it may not onely tend to breake, but may actually breake the Civill Peace.

Defender.

Then the distinction is acknowledged to have a reall Truth in it. what lacketh it yet, but that it may stand?

Discusser.

Yet those instances (to wit those 6. mentioned in Chap. 7.) are Cases of great Opposition and Spirituall Hostility, and Occasions of the breach of the Civill Peace: yet the matter and manner pure, holy, peaceable and inoffensive.

Defender.

Then these six instances doe nothing concerne the distinction in

in hand, which speaketh of holding forth for the matter things Erroneous, and unlawfull: and for the manner in a disturbant way to Civill Peace. But it seemeth if something, if any thing, (though nothing to purpose) be said in the Discussion of a distinction, it may goe for a Discussion.

Discusser.

Moreover I answer, That it is possible, and common for Persons of soft and gentle nature and spirits, to hold out falshood with more seeming meeknesse, and Peaceablenesse, then the Lord Jesus or his servants did or doe hold forth the everlasting Gospel; So that the Answerer would be requested to explaine, what he meaneth by this Arrogant and Impetuous holding forth of any Doctrine, which very manner of holding tendeth to break the Civill Peace, and cometh under the Cognisance, and Correction of the Civill Magistrate &c.

Discharge.

Himselfe hath said it, and done it already in this Chapter, and I have done the same, (somewhat more largely) in the Chapter next foregoing.

CHAP. 9.

A Reply to his ninth Chapter, Touching the Causes of Civill Dissensions, and uprores about Matters of Religion.

Discusser.

Whence then arise Civill Dissensions and uprores in matters of Religion? I Answer, 1. When a State liveth and lieth in the guilt of a false God, false Christ, false Worship: then no wonder, if soere eyes be troubled at the appearance of light, — whereas good eyes are not troubled at the Light. Vigilant and watchfull Persons, Loyall and Faithfull are not so troubled at the true, no nor at a false Religion of Jew or Gentile.

D

Discharge.

Discharge.

This is as little to the purpose, as that which went before. The distinction spake of holding forth Erroneous and unlawful things, in a way tending of it selfe, to the disturbance of Civill Peace. This Discussion holdeth forth another way tending to the disturbance of Civill Peace, not of it selfe, but by occasion or by Accident, to wit, when the holding forth of Light and Truth disturbeth the fore Eyes of a corrupt State. If *per se*, and *per Accidens* (of it selfe, and by occasion) be all one: If the holding forth of Truth, and Error be all one, then this Discussion hath shaken the distinction of holding forth Error, not in an humble and meeke way, but in a way of Arrogance and Impetuousnesse. But when he saith, *vigilant and faithfull Persons are not so troubled, no not at the false Religion of Jew or Gentile*: If he meane not so much troubled at the false Religion, as corrupt States be at the true Religion: there may be truth in the speech, but it onely argueth, That corrupt nature is more zealous in the defence of its owne will-worship, then the faithfull be in the defence of the Truth. But surely the faithfull are called to contend Earnestly for the Faith, (*Jude 3.*) and have as much cause to be troubled at the holding forth of the Worship of *Baal*, as corrupt States be at the holding forth of the Worship of *Jehovah*. If his meaning be, that vigilant and faithfull Persons, are not so troubled at the false Religion of *Jew or Gentile*, but that they can Tolerate them to live amongst them in a Civill Body, we say so too: And therefore the *Indians*, who have submitted to the Government of this jurisdiction, are not compelled to the Profession or acknowledgement of our Religion, either by Force of Armes, or Penall Lawes. But yet if Christians should seduce Christians to turne Apostates from the Faith, and to imbrace *Judaisme*, or *Paganisme*: Or if *Jewes* or *Pagans* living amongst us shou'd openly blaspheme the God of heaven, & draw away Christians to *Atheisme*, or *Judaisme*, I should not account them either vigilant, or faithfull Christians, that were not troubled at such a destroying of the true Religion, and propagating of the false. Paul blamed the false Teachers to be the Troublers of the Churches of *Galatia*, *Gal. 5. 10, 12. Acts 15. 24.*

Discuss.

2. Breach of Civill Peace may arise when false and Idolatrous practises are

are held forth, and yet no Breach of Civill Peace from the Doctrines, or Practise, or the manner of holding them forth, but from the wrong and preposterous way of Suppressing, and preventing and extinguishing such Errors by weapons of wrath and Bloud, Whips, Stocks, Imprisonment, Banishment, Death, by which men are commonly perswaded to convert Hereticks, and to cast out uncleane spirits, which onely the finger of God can doe, that is, the mighty Power of the Spirit of the Word. It is light alone that is able to dispell and scatter such mists and fogs of darknesse in the soules and Consciences of men.

Hence the Sonnes of men disquiet themselves in vaine, and unmercifully disquiet others.

Defender.

Then it seemeth, that if the *Mariners* of the *Ship* wherein *Jonah* layled when he fled from the Presence of God, if they I say did cast *Jonah* over board into the Sea, this preposterous way of theirs in suppressing the Error of his way, was it which raised the storme and Tempest, whereby the *Ship* was tossed to and fro, & disturbed, yea & in jeopardy to be sunk and destroyed. But the Text speakes to the contrary, when they had cast *Jonah* forth into the Sea, the Sea ceased from his raging, *Jonah* 1. 15.

But what was the sinne of *Jonah*? was it not some sinne against the second Table, some act of unrighteousnesse against his Neighbour? It was a direct and immediate breach of a rule of his Propheticall Office, a sin against the second Commandement of the First Table. But was not the Sea, in which this tempest arose against *Jonah*, and against the whole *Ship* for his sake, was it not the Sea of *Tiberias*, which being within the Confines of the Holy Land, the Sea also was Holy, and would not suffer such a sin unpunished? No, the Sea of *Tiberias* is within the Confines of *Galilee*, and other parts of the Land of *Israel*; But this was the *Mediterranean* Sea, between *Joppa* and *Tarsish*, *Jonah* 1. 3. But were not these *Mariners*, *Israelites*, who might have some speciall charge from God, to roote out all Idolatry and false Worship from amongst them, which bindeth not us *Gentiles*? No, they were *Pagans* and *Gentiles*, as appeareth in that every one of them cryed out, unto his own God.

But why did not God send out the tempest to punish those *Pagan*

gan *Mariners* rather, for their Idolatry then *Jonah* for his Erroneous Practise in running away from the true God?

God in times past suffered all Nations to walke in their owne wayes *Acts*, 14. 16. And so did his Vicegerents the good Kings of *Israel* doe the like: *David* did not compell the tributary Nations to worship the God of *Israel*. No more doth our Colony here compell the tributary *Indians* to worship our God. But if an *Israelite* forsake God, he disturbeth not onely the Common-wealth of *Israel*, but the Barks of *Pagans*, and *Heathen* States as *Jonah* did this *Ship*, by his departure from God. Therefore a Christian by departing from God, may disturbe a *Gentile* civill State. And it is no preposterous way for the Governours of the State, according to the quality of the disturbance raised by the starting aside of such a Christian, to punish both it and him by civill censure.

Nor doth the Civill State in such punishments attend so much, how to procure the conversion of Heretickes, or Apostates, or such like scandalous turbulent offenders: as how to prevent the perversion of their sounder people (*Gangrenam amoveas, ne pars sincera trahatur:*) or else to worke the subversion of such, as doe subvert both truth and peace.

And yet as legall terrours are ordinary meanes blessed of God to prepare hard and stout hearts to conversion: so such legall punishments God is in like sort pleased to blesse to the confusion, and reformation of false Prophets, as was foretold by *Zacharie*, it should come to passe in the dayes of the new Testament, *Zach.* 13. 4, 5, 6.

Obiect. Yea, but it is light alone that is able to dispell and scatter such mists and foggs of darknesse in the soules and Consciences of men.

Ans. True: But yet the judgements of God are as the Light that goeth forth, *Hosea* 6. 5. And the judgements of men executed according to the Word, are sanctified of God to prevent the spreading of Idolatry and seducement to it; All *Israel* shall heare and feare, and doe no more presumptuously, *Deut.* 13. 11. Nor is the righteous proceeding in Civill States a disquieting of themselves, or any unmercifull disquieting of others. For it is no disquieting to a just man to doe Justice: and the disquieting of men in sinne, it is no unmercifull dealing, but a compassionate healing either of themselves or others. The false Prophet reclaimed by stigmatizing with wounds

wounds in his hands, will freely acknowledge, thus was I wounded in the House of my friends (*Zach. 13. 6.*) Friends are not unmercifull disquieters.

Object. The Judgements of God which goe forth as the light are not of the Judgements of his hand, but of his mouth, for so he explaineth himselfe in that place of *Hosea*, I have hewen them by the Prophets, I have slaine them by the words of my mouth: And thy Judgements were as the light that goeth forth.

Ans. The Judgements of God, whether of his mouth or of his hand, doe both of them goe forth as light. For when the Judgements of God are upon the earth (and he speaketh of the judgments of his hands,) *the Inhabitants of the world shall learne righteousness*, *Isai. 26. 9.* And that whereby we learne righteousness, is light. Besides when the Lord is said to have hewen, and slaine his Apostate people by his Prophets, and by the words of his mouth; He doth not onely meane the spirituall hewing, and slaying of their soules, but also the temporall judgements, Famine, Warre, and Pestilence, which the Prophets threatned, and the Hand of God, and *Hazael* executed in the hewing and slaying of them.

CHAP. IO.

A Reply to his tenth Chapter, wherein he discusseth the last Distinction.

Persecution for Conscience, is either for conscience rightly informed, or a blind and erroneous conscience.

Discusser.

Both these Consciences are indeed persecuted: but lamentably blinde and erroneous will those consciences shortly appeare to be, which out of zeale to God (as is pretended) have persecuted either, &c.

Defender.

This whole Chapter may stand for us, without Impeachment. We approve no persecution for conscience, neither conscience rightly informed, (for that we account the persecuting of Christ :) nor conscience misinformed with error: unlesse the error be pernicious,

pernicious, and unless the conscience be convinced of the error and perniciousness thereof, that so it may appeare, the erroneous party suffereth, not for his conscience, but for his sinning against his conscience.

And though it be true, there is a seared conscience in some, to which God hath in his judgement, given them up, that they may never see light, how cleare soever, both in Scripture and nature; and though this seared conscience doe not extenuate, but aggravate sinne; and though a man by this seared conscience may commit some notorious capitall crime, (as he that in *Ireland* burnt his owne sonne in the fire, in the imitation of *Abraham*, and called in his Neighbours to rejoyce in beholding the power of his faith:) and though such a man was justly put to death: yet it may not be said, he was punished for his conscience, but for that unnaturall barbarous cruelty and murther, which he committed, and which his conscience could never have blinded him to commit, out of any naturall humane ignorance, or infirmity, but out of peenall and judiciall blindness, which God never leaveth men unto, but upon habituall and customary sinning against light of conscience.

CHAP. II.

A Reply to his eleventh Chapter touching Persecution for Conscience rightly informed.

Discusser.

After explication of the Point in these former Distinctions, the Answerer of the Letter giveth his Resolution to the Question in foure particulars.

1. It is not lawfull to persecute any for Conscience sake rightly informed, for in persecuting such, Christ himselfe is persecuted, Acts 9.4.

A man may as soone finde darkenesse in the bright Beames of the Sunne, as in this cleare Beame of Truth, that Christ Jesus in his Truth must not be persecuted.

(Yet this I must aske, (for it will be admired by all sober men) what should be the Cause or Inducement to the answerers minde to lay downe such

such a Position or Thesis as this is, It is not lawfull to persecute the Lord Jesus.

Search all Scriptures, Histories, Records, Monuments, consult with all Experiences; Did ever Pharaoh, Saul, Ahab, Jezebel, Scribes and Pharisees, the Jewes, Herod, the bloody Neroes, Gardiners, Bonner, Pope or Devill himselfe professe to persecute the Sonne of God, Jesus as Jesus, Christ as Christ, without Maske or Covering?

Defender.

It may seeme though the Truth be as cleare as the Beames of the Sunne, yet the Discusser can espie a moate of admirable weaknesse in the delivering of such a Position, though never so true or cleare. But let him cease his Admiration, unlesse it be to admire his owne Fancy.

For I do not lay it downe as a Position, that it is not lawfull to persecute the Lord Jesus: or that Christ in his Truth must not be persecuted. But my Position was, It is not lawfull to persecute any for Conscience sake, rightly informed: And for a reason hereof, I give this Principle, for in persecuting such, Christ is persecuted: Is it now become an admirable strange thing to give a Principle of Religion, not for a Position, (and yet if it were so, what strange thing were it?) but for the prooffe of a Position? Let me give you a like instance, Gamaliel layeth it downe for a Position, that the Doctrine of the Apostles, if it be of God, the Priests and Elders cannot overthrow it: and he gives this principle for a reason of it, lest in so doing, ye be found (saith he) to fight against God, Acts 5. 38, 39. Now is this such a matter as will be admired of all sober men, that so wise a man as Gamaliel should lay downe this as a Position, That men should not be found fighters against God? May not a man rather admire and adore the strange hand of God, that shall leave a man soberly to admire at such a thing, and to thinke all sober men will in like sort wonder at the same? But the truth is, Neither Gamaliel, nor my selfe, laid downe that Principle for a Conclusion, nor for a Position: nor if we had, had we done any thing for sober men to admire at.

2. Though it were true, (which the Discusser makes the Ground of his Admiration,) That no Pharaoh, or Herod, or Nero, did ever professe to persecute the Sonne of God, Christ as Christ; &c. yet,

yet it will not make it an admirable Point, that Christ as Christ is not to be persecuted. For though they doe not professe to persecute Christ as Christ: yet they doe it. And it is no admirable matter for all sober men to admire at, to tell men that persecute the Lord Jesus, That it is not lawfull for them so to doe: Did not Christ himselfe (the wisdom of the Father) tell *Saul* as much? *Acts 9. 5.*

3. It is as cleare, (to use his phrase) as the Sunnie beames, both in Scripture and other histories, and frequent experience, That Tyrants and Apostates have often persecuted Jesus as Jesus, Christ as Christ. The Scribes and Pharisees they knew that Christ was the Sonne of God, the Lord, and Heire of the Church: And therefore they said among themselves, *This is the Heire, come let us kill him, Matth. 21.38.* Nor could they be said, in persecuting Christ, to have sinned against the Holy Ghost: if they had not bene enlightened to know him who he was, and yet leavened with such malice, as to persecute him, as they did. Histories tell us, that *Julian* the Apostate persecuted Jesus as Jesus, and Christ as Christ, yea and professed so to doe. And experience telleth, That if a Christian shall in *Turkey* seeke to gaine *Turkes* from the service of *Mahomet*, to the Faith of Jesus: they will persecute such a Christian to death, and in him Jesus, as Jesus.

4. Let Tyrants and Persecutors professe what they will, that they doe not persecute Jesus as Jesus, but under some other pretence: yet that varieth not the Truth, nor impeacheth the wisdom of this Position, That it is not lawfull to persecute any for Conscience rightly informed, or to persecute any for professing the Truth of Christ.

Discusser.

One thing I see apparently in the Lords overruling of the pen of this Answerer, viz. a secret whispering from Heaven to him, That yet he hath never left the Tents of such who thinke they doe God good service in killing the Lord Jesus in his servants, and yet say if we had been in the dayes of our Fathers in *Queen Maryes* dayes, we would never have consented to such Persecution &c.

Defender.

Verily this is a strange sight indeed, (and which all sober minds may

may well wonder at) to see apparently, That he who layeth downe this for a Position, That it is not lawfull to persecute any for Conscience rightly informed, hath had a secret whispering from Heaven, that himselfe never yet left the Tents of Persecutors.

Surely it must needs be a strange and strong sight, even the sight of such as make themselves equall with God; that can see a man hath not left the Tents of Persecutors, (that is, the Communion with Persecutors) when he openly professeth it, to be utterly unlawfull to Persecute any for the Truths sake. It is true, God may see that in a mans heart which is contrary to the Profession of his mouth and Pen. And so may this *Discussor* see as much, if he be equall with God. But yet herein I dare be bold to say, he exalteth himselfe, not onely equall with God, but above God, to see one contradictory in another, which God himselfe cannot see. It is contradictory to Persecution, to beleive it unlawfull to persecute any for the Truths sake. He then that can see, yea & see apparently, & that out of the Faith & Profession of this truth, that it is unlawfull to persecute any for the Truth, he that can see (I say) fellowship with persecution in the faith, or Profession of the unlawfulness of Persecution, verily he can see darknesse in light, evill in good, Falshood in Truth, which God himselfe (Such is the perfection of his Truth) cannot doe.

Discussor.

Let me also add a second, So farre as the Answerer (by Preaching for Persecution) hath been a guide to others in persecuting any of the Servants of Christ witnessing to his Truth, so farre his own mouth and hands shall judge (I hope not his person, but) his actions, that the Lord Jesus hath suffered by him.

Defender.

If any Doctrine Preached by me have Guided any to persecute any of the Servants of Christ for witnessing to any Truth of Christ, then I confesse I must lay my hand upon my mouth, and acknowledge that the Lord Jesus hath suffered by me. But if the *Discussor* can never be able to produce any such Doctrine broached by me, that hath guided any to persecute any of Gods Servants for witnessing to any Truth of his, (as I trust in the grace of Christ, he shall never be able) then the *Discussor* may know (and the Lord

help his spirit to know it) that his own mouth and hands, shal one day judge (if not his person, yet) his actions, that the Lord Jesus hath suffered in his poore Servants, even bitter persecutions by his unjust slanders.

CHAP. 12.

A Reply to his twelue Chapter Entering upon the Discussion of the unlawfulness to Persecute an Erroneous and blinde Conscience.

Discusser.

The second Conclusion lay'd downe by the Answerer, is: *It is not lawfull to persecute an Erroneous and blinde Conscience, Even in Fundamentall, and weighty Points, till after Admonition once, or twice Tit. 3. 10, 11. And then such Consciences may be persecuted; because the Word of God is so cleare, in Fundamentall and weighty Points, that such a person cannot but sinne against his Conscience, and so being condemned of himselfe, that is of his Conscience, he may be persecuted for sinning against his own Conscience.*

Defender.

They are the words of the Discusser, not mine, That such as erre in Fundamentall and weighty Points, after once or twice Admonition, such Consciences are then to be persecuted.

No, my words will cleare themselves if they be truly related, even as himselfe hath printed them. Thus they stand.

Secondly, For an erroneous and blinde Conscience, even in Fundamentall and weighty Points, It is not lawfull to persecute any, till after Admonition once or twice. And so the Apostle directeth Tit. 3. 10. and giveth the reason, That in Fundamentall & principall Points of Doctrine and worship, The Word of God in such things is so cleare, that he cannot but be convinced in conscience of the dangerous Error of his way, after once or twice Admonition, wisely and faithfully dispenced. And then if any one persist, It is not out of Conscience, but against his Conscience, as the Apostle saith, ver. 11. He is subverted and sinneth being condemned of himselfe, that is, of his owne Conscience, so that if such a man after such Admonition, shall still persist in the Error of his way, and be therefore

therefore punished, He is not persecuted for cause of Conscience, but for sinning against his Conscience.

Where though I say, That it is not lawfull to persecute any, though erring in Fundamental and weighty Points, till after once or twice admonition: I doe not therefore say, (as the Discusser reporteth me) that after once or twice admonition, then such Consciences may be persecuted: But that if such a man after such Admonition shall still persist in the Error of his way, and be therefore punished, He is not persecuted for cause of Conscience, but for sinning against his own Conscience.

Object. But he that sayeth, It is not lawfull to persecute any Heretick till after once or twice admonition, He doth as much as say, that after once or twice admonition, It is then lawfull to persecute any Heretick.

Ans. Not so neither, neither every Heretick, nor in every Court. Not in every Court or Judicature. But the same Church that followed an Heretick, with once or twice admonition, was further to pursue him, if he remaine obstinate, with excommunication; my words doe expresse two things:

1. That an Heretick till after once or twice admonition, may not be pursued, no not with the Church-censure of Excommunication: but after once or twice admonition, It was then lawfull for the Church to proceed to his Excommunication.

2. My words hold forth this also, That if such an Heretick so convinced and admonished, be afterwards punished by any Censure, whether of Church or Court, It cannot be said, he is punished for his Conscience, but for sinning against his Conscience.

But it was no part of my words or meaning, to say, that every Heretick, though erring in some Fundamentall and weighty Points, and for the same excommunicated, shall forth with be punished by the Civill Magistrate: unlesse it doe afterwards appeare, that he breake forth further, either into Blasphemy, or Idolatry, or seducement of others to his Hereticall pernicious wayes.

mid Discusser.

This third of Titus, which through fearefull Prophanations hath so many hundred yeares bin the pretended Bulwarke of all the bloody wolues, Dens of Lyons, Mountaines of Leopards hunting and devouring the

witneses

witnesses of Jesus. He that can but see men as Trees, may easily discern, It shall now be the Refuge and Defence (as I hope) of the Lamb's and little ones of Jesus.

Defender.

It is out of doubt, That this Text is, (as all the Texts in Scripture be) the just Refuge and safe defence of the Lambes, and little ones of Jesus. But all the wit and skill of the *Discounter*, can never so farre wrest it, or darken it, as to make it a Refuge and defence for Heretickes, which is the Point in hand.

CHAP. 13.

A Reply to his thirteenth Chapter, what is meant by this Heretick in Titus.

Discounter.

What is this Heretick? I find him commonly defined to be, such an one as is obstinate in Fundamentalls. And so the *Answerer* seemeth to Resent him, saying, the Apostle rendereth this reason, why after once or twice Admonition, he ought to be Persecuted, because, in Fundament all and Principall Points of Doctrine and Worship, the Word of God is so cleare, that the Heretick cannot but be convinced in his owne Conscience. But of this Reason I find not one Title mentioned in this Scripture: for so he saith, such an one is condemned of himselfe, yet he saith not, nor will it follow, that Fundamentalls are so cleare, that after first and second Admonition, a Person that submitteth not to them, is condemned of himselfe, more then in lesser Points.

This word then an Heretick is no more, then an obstinate and willfull person in the Church of Christ striving and contending about unprofitable Questions & Genealogies. What is to be done with such an one? Let him be once and twice Admonished. What if once and twice Admonition prevaile not? The Apostle seemeth to Answer, ἀπειλόμενος, that is, the man that is willfully obstinate, after once or twice Admonition, Reject him.

Defender.

The *Discounter* is so farre from weakening what I said from this Text in Titus, that he rather confirmeth it, yea and graunteth a larger

larger allowance to proceed against erroneous Persons, then I did.
For,

1. Whereas I had said, The Apostle directeth the Church to proceed against an Heretick, that is against one obstinately erroneous in Fundamentals, The *Discusser* saith, *yea and against such as erre though not in Fundamentals, but in lesser points, and continue obstinate in striving about unprofitable Questions, and Genealogies.*

2. He that graunteth (as the *Discusser* doth) that the Word of God is so cleare even in lesser Points, that he that persisteth in his error after once or twice Admonition, is willfully obstinate: he surely will not sticke to acknowledge, that the word of God is much more cleare in Fundamentall and Principall Points, that he that shall persist in Errors against the Foundation, after once or twice Admonition, he cannot but be much more justly accounted willfully obstinate, and so sinne against the light of his owne Conscience.

3. Though he saith he findeth no one Tittle in the Text, that in Fundamentall and Principall Points of Doctrine and Worship, the Word of God is so cleare, that after once or twice Admonition, the Heretick cannot but be convinced in his owne Conscience. Yet he might easily find it, and cannot but find it, if he were pleased to ponder the words of the Text: yea and he doth find it, though he be pleased to deny it. For the Heretick (whom the Text speaketh of) himselfe expoundeth to be a man willfully obstinate: An Evidence, that he erreth not through want of light, or weaknesse of knowledge, but through strength of will. Whence also he is said to be condemned of himselfe, of his owne Conscience: An Evidence that the Points about which he erreth, are so clearely delivered in Scripture, that after once or twice Admonition, the Heretick cannot but be convinced in his owne Conscience. And if this hold in sundry lesser Points, how much more doth it hold in Fundamentals and Principalls? Unless he thinke the Holy Ghost be more darke, & obscure in delivering Principles and milke to Babes, then in delivering lesser Points to men of riper growth. If the word be so cleare as to make Fundamentals cleare, (though not any more cleare, as he saith, then lesser Points) yet then it followeth, It maketh them both so cleare, that he that submitte not to them after once, or twice Admonition is condemned of himselfe.

4. When

4. When the Apostle saith, an Heretick is subverted, *ἡσπαρται*, it is as much as if he had said, he is as an house subverted, or turned upside downe, or inside outward, as an house turned off from the Foundation: It is too dilute, and loose an Interpretation of the word *ἡσπαρται*, (which the *Discussers* maketh, Chap. 14.) *ἡσπαρται*, he is turned Crooked, a word opposite to streightnesse, or rightnesse. For he is not ignorant, that is not the meaning of *ἡσπαρται*, but of *ἰσπαρται*, which he joyneth with the other, meane, turned-crooked: for that is not subverted, but perverted. And if Paul say, that the Heretick is subverted, or turned off from the Foundation, and gives that as a reason, why he should be censured, how then can the *Discussers* say, he findeth not one tittle of this reason in this Scripture?

5. Take the *Discussers* own Interpretation of an Hereticks, for an obstinate and willfull striver or contender about unprofitable Questions and Genealogies:

Those Questions and Genealogies, are expressly described by the Apostle, not onely to be unprofitable and vaine, but also to tend to the subversion of whole houses, Tit. 1. 10, 11. which may seeme evidently to argue, that their disputings about the Genealogies of Christ, tended to cut off the Line of Christ, or at least to make it doubtfull, whether he were the lineall Heire of David, according to the flesh, and so whether he were the true *Messiah* or no. And thus, if the *Discussers* owne meaning of an Heretick may stand, still an Heretick is he, who is willfully obstinate in holding forth such Errors as subvert the Foundation of Christian Religion.

CHAP. 14.

A Reply to his foureteenth Chapter, Explaining what it is to be subverted and selfe condemned.

Discussers.

Subverted is not here intended to be spoken of Hereticks in Fundamentallionely, but of men obstinate in the lesser Questions.

1. Subverted, *ἡσπαρται*, Crooked, a word opposite to rightnesse or streightnesse.

2. He ſinneſh wandering from the wayes of Truth :

3. He is ἀποκατακρίσθαι, and condemned of himſelf, that is, by the ſecret checks and whiſperings of his owne Conſcience, which will take Gods part againſt a mans ſelfe, in accuſing, ſmiting &c.

Defender.

All this ſo farre as Error is found in it, is ſpoken to, & diſcharged in the former Chapter.

Onely 2. Things more remaine in this Chapter which may not paſſe without ſome touch.

1. That he ſaith Gods People in all their awakenings acknowledge how ſleightly they have liſtned to the checks of their owne Conſcience. This the Answerer pleaſeth to call ſinning againſt Conſcience : for which he may lawfully be perſecuted, to wit, for ſinning againſt his owne Conſcience.

Wherein there is found a double falſhood : 1. That he ſaith, I call the ſleight liſtnings of Gods People to the checks of their Conſcience, their ſinning againſt Conſcience. For I ſpeake not of the ſinning of Gods People againſt Conſcience, but of an Heretick ſubverted turned off from the Foundation : much leſſe doe I call their ſleight liſtnings to Conſcience, to be Hereticall ſinning againſt Conſcience.

2. Leſt of all doe I ſay, that for ſuch ſleight liſtnings to the checks of Conſcience, he may lawfully be perſecuted, to wit, as for ſinning againſt Conſcience. Thus men that have time and leaſure at will, will ſet up Images of clouts, and then ſhoot at them.

The 2. Thing in this Chapter (which I ſaid might not paſſe without ſome touch) is, that having faſtned upon me a concluſion, (which is none of mine, but an invention of his owne) He addeth, howſoever it be painted over with vermillion &c. yet he hopeth to manifeſt it to be the overturning and rooting up of the roote of all true Chriſtianity, and abſolutely denying the Lord Jeſus to be come in the fleſh.

Whereto I Reply no more but this: If he doe manifeſt that which Magnanimouſly he undertaketh, It may happily be alſo manifeſted (by the helpe of Chriſt) that it will overturne no concluſion of mine. But howſoever, let him remember it was a proverb in Iſrael, Let not him that girdeth on his Armour, boaſt himſelfe, as he that putteth it off 2 Kings 20. 11.

Chap. 15.

C H A P T E R 15.

A Reply to his fifteenth Chapter touching the admonition and rejection of an Heretick.

THe first and second Admonitions in the place of Titus were not Civill or corporall punishments on mens persons, or purses: But they were the reprehensions, convictions, exhortations, and perswasions of the word of the Eternall God, charged home to the Conscience, in the Name and Presence of the Lord Jesus in the midst of his Church. Which being despised, and not hearkened unto, in the last place followeth rejection, which is not a cutting off by beheading, hanging, burning, nor an expelling out of the Countrey, and coasts: but the dreadfull cutting off from the visible head and body, Christ Jesus, and his Church—Spiritual cutting off by Excommunication.

Defender.

All this, & the proofes of this, in this Chapter, I willingly consent and subscribe unto: nor doth this touch any conclusion of mine at all, much lesse Discusse, or shake it. For though I said indeed, that for an erroneous and blinde Conscience (even in Fundamentall and weighty Points) It is not lawfull to persecute any, till after Admonition once or twice, according to Tit. 3. 10. 11.

Yet in alledging that place, to prove that Conclusion, I intended no other persecution, but the Churches prosecution against such an Heretick by excommunication: no syllable in my conclusion looketh at more.

If it be said, but Excommunication or any other Church-prosecution, cannot fitly be called persecution: Yes verily, excommunication is a persecution, and a lawfull persecution, if the cause be just offence, (as the Angell of the Lord is said to persecute the wicked Psalm. 35. 6.) But the Excommunication is a cruell and bitter persecution, If it be without just cause and due order: yea and the more greivous persecution, by how much the more greivous it is to a Christian man, to be excluded from the Communion of the Saints, then to be banished from a civill Society, sure it is, the Lord Jesus accounteth it a persecution to his Disciples, to be delivered up unto the Synagogues, and to be cast forth out of the Synagogues Luk. 21. 12. with Job. 16. 2.

Chap. 16.

CHAP. 16.

A Reply to his sixteenth Chapter touching Toleration in Points of lesse moment.

Discusser.

For a third Position, or Conclusion, the Answerer gave this, that in things of lesse moment (whether Points of Doctrine or Worship) If a man hold them forth in a spirit of Christian meeknesse and love, (though with zeale and constancy) he is not to be persecuted, but tolerated, till God may be pleased to manifest his truth to him.

This conclusion I acknowledge to be the Truth of God; yet 3. things are very observeable in the manner of laying it downe.

1. That such a Person may be tolerated, till God may be pleased to reveale his truth to him: upon the same ground the Apostle calleth for meeknesse and Gentlenesse towards all men, and towards such as oppose themselves; 2. Tim. 2. because it may be, God may give them repentance. Hence a soule that is lively and sensible of Gods mercy, cannot but be patient, and gentle towards the Jewes—towards the Turkes—yea to all the severall sorts of Anti-Christians, yea to the Pagans, and to the wildest sort of the Sonnes of men, who have not heard of the Father and of the Sonne, &c. Yea not onely be patient to such, but also to pray for such, yea and to endeavour their participation of the same grace and mercy.

Defender.

This nothing shaketh, no nor so much as toucheth our cause, or defence; we thinke it unlawfull for the Church, to censure such, as are out of the Church. And for the Civill State, we know no ground they have to persecute Jewes, or Turkes, or other Pagans for cause of Religion, though they all erre in Fundamentalls. No nor would I exempt Anti-Christians neither, from Toleration, notwithstanding their Fundamentall Errors, unlesse after conviction they still continue to seduce simple soules into their damnable, and pernicious Heresies: as into the Worship of false Gods, into confidence of their owne merits for Justification, into seditious conspiracies against the lives and States of such Princes, as will not submit their Consciences to the Bishop of Rome. Which if the

Discusser shall in the sequell pluck off as the silken covering of an Image (as he calleth it) we shall further attend him.

Discusser.

2. I observe from the Scriptures he quoteth for this Toleration (Phil. 3. Rom. 14.) how closely (yet I hope unadvisedly) he maketh the Churches of Christ at Philippi, and Rome, all one with the Cities of Philippi, and Rome &c.

Defender.

No such matter: I never thought these Scriptures to belong at all to the Cities of Philippi or Rome, Paul writeth to both the Churches not only to tolerate, but to receive their weake brethren, who dissent from them in matters of lesse moment: but to the Cities, I never read any Epistle of his. Who would ever imagine, the Discusser should be so farre transported beyond all bounds, either of reason, or truth, or candor, as to surmise the Answerer should conceive, That what those Churches must not tolerate in their holy communion, that the Cities of Philippi and Rome must not tolerate within the compasse of the City, State, and Jurisdiction.

Discusser.

3. From this Toleration of persons bolding but lesser errors, I observe the unmercifulnesse of such Doctrines and Hearts, that he, that is sleightly and but a little hurt shall be suffered, & meanes vouchsafed for his cure: but the deep-wounded sinner, the Leprous, and Vicerous &c. must not be suffered, untill peradventure God may give them Repentance &c.

Defender.

And why doth he not aswell observe the unmercifulnesse of such States and Lawes, as suffer petty theives, and liars to live in their Townes & Cities: but will not suffer willful murderers, & violent robbers to live amongst them? such as are tainted with lesser Errors, and it may be, whet them upon others, they are but as petty theives, and lyars: but such as after conviction doe goe on to subvert the Foundation of Christian Religion and to subvert and destroy the soules of Gods People, and stoutly robb them both of the meanes of Grace here, and of the inheritance of glory hereafter, they are worse then willfull murderers, or violent robbers. The Holy Ghost speaketh of false Teachers, as bringing in damnable Heresies, 2 Pet. 2. 1. as overthrowing the faith of some 2 Tim. 2. 18. as subverting their soules, Acts 15. 24. making merchan-

dize

dize of Gods People 2 Pet. 2. 3. which being so, me thinkes, such as do more mischief, are lesse tolerable, then they that doe lesse. It is true, they that are more deeply wounded-finnners, are more to be pittied, suppose the depth of their wounds reach none but themselves; but if they be infectious, and Leprous, and have Plague sores running upon them, and thinke it their glory to infect others; It is no want of mercy, and charity, to set such at a distance: It is a mercilesse mercy, to pittie such as are incurably contagious, and mischeivous, and not to pittie many scores or hundreds of the soules of such, as will be infected and destroyed by the toleration of the other.

CHAP. 17.

A Reply to his seventeenth Chapter: touching the holding forth of Error with a boisterous and arrogant Spirit.

Discusser.

It is said by the Answerer, He that holdeth forth Error with a boisterous and arrogant spirit to the disturbance of the Civill Peace, he ought to be punished.

To this I have spoken too, confessing that if any man commit ought of those things, which Paul was accused of Acts 25. 11. He ought not to be spared: yea he ought not in such case to refuse to die.

Defender.

I would not say, That every man that holdeth forth Error in a boisterous and arrogant spirit to the disturbance of Civill Peace, ought to be punished with death. This is too Bloudy a Tenet, unlesse the boisterous Arrogancy were such as did disturbe the Civill Peace to the destruction of the lives and soules of men.

Discusser.

But if the matter be of a Spirituall and Divine nature, I have written before, in many cases, and might in many more, that the worship which a State professeth, may be contradicted and preached against, and yet no breach of Civill Peace, &c.

Defender. There is no Error, that can be a matter of divine nature, though it may be spirituall; no such Points as are of a divine nature, fall within the compasse of this dispute of persecution. The many cases, which the *Discusser* before wrote of, are all of them allowed, but none of them concerne holding forth of Errors, which is the Point in hand.

Yet true it is, that if a man hold forth Truth in some boisterous and arrogant way, not with the Armour of the Spirit, but with the Arme of flesh, He may in so doing disturbe the Civill Peace, and for such disturbance be justly punished, according to the quality of the disturbance raised by him.

It is easily graunted what the *Discusser* further avoucheth, that they doe break the Cities or Kingdomes Peace, who cry out for Prisons, and Swords, against such who crosse their Judgements, or Practise in Religion: to wit unlesse their Religion be of God, and the crossing of it be such as destroyeth and subverteth the Religion of God.

But when he saith, such onely breake the Cities or Kingdomes Peace, as call for Prisons and Swords against Hereticks. It is too vast an Hyperbole; as if Murderers Seditious Persons, Rebels, Traytors were none of them such, as did breake the Cities or Kingdomes Peace at all: but they onely who are too sharpe against corruptions in Religion.

It is also further easily graunted, which he alledgeth, that many complaine most, who are most in fault themselves, as *Josephs* Mistresse of him. The Lord helpe the *Discusser* to reflect upon his own way.

CHAP. 18.

A Reply to his Eighteenth Chapter, Examining the first Argument for Toleration from Mat. 13. 30, 38.

Discusser.

First, Mat. 13. 30, 38. Christ Commandeth to let alone the Tares, to grow up together with the wheat, untill the Harvest.

Unto which he Answereth,

That

That Tares are not Bryars and Thornes, but partly Hypocrites like unto the Godly, but indeed carnall (as the Tares are like to the wheat, but are not wheat) or partly such corrupt Doctrines and Practises, as are indeed unsound, but yet such as come very neere the Truth (as Tares doe to the wheat) and so neere that good men may be taken with them, and so the Persons in whom they grow, cannot be rooted out, but good wheat will be rooted out with them. In such a case, Christ calleth for Peaceable Toleration, not for pœnall Prosecution according to the third Conclusion.

But alas here is no evidence or demonstration of the Spirit, nor argument from the place it selfe, or from the Scriptures of Truth, to prove such an Interpretation.

Defender.

Ans. The Letter (to which the Answer was given) gave no reason of his exposition: and who ever required more reason of an Answerer, then of a Replyer?

2. The Exposition I gave was consistent with that which the Letter gave. [Tares and wheat, saith he, some understand to be those that walke in the Truth, and those that walke in lyes] now when I say, the tares are Hypocrites, and some kind of corrupt Doctrines and Practises, and such as walke in them, are not these coincident with such as walke in lyes? what need had I to give a reason of the exposition, which he himselfe (to whom the Answer was written) acknowledgeth?

Discusser.

But those three Persons, Doctrines and Practises, are as a threefold cord, and so a threefold strong snare to catch the feet of some or other.

Defender.

What hurt doe they get by being caught? Hypocrites, and corrupt Doctrines, and Practises, if they be found like unto good Christians, or sound truthes, what hurt doe they catch, when I say such are to be tolerated to the end of the world? But to prevent his feare of a threefold cord, I shall easily acknowledge that which I meant, that by Tares are meant such kinde of evill persons, as are like unto the good, whether they be Hipocrites, men of unsound heartes, or men of unsound Doctrines, and Practises yet such as come neere the Truth.

C H A P. 19.

A Reply to his nineteenth Chapter.

Discusser.

That the Lord intendeth not Doctrines, or Practises in this Parable,
It is cleare: For,

1. The Lord Jesus expressly interpreteth the good seed to be Persons, & those the children of the Kingdom: The Tares also to signify men, and those the children of the wicked one ver. 38.

Defender.

If the Discusser had cast his eye a little lower, he might have found, that Christ interpreteth the Tares, not onely to be Persons, but things *πᾶν τὸ πικρὸν* all things that offend, as well as those that doe iniquity ver. 41. But I shall not stick upon that at all, let the Tares be Persons, whether Hypocrites, like unto true Christians, or holders forth of scandalous, and corrupt, Doctrines and Practises like unto sound.

Discusser.

2. Such corrupt Doctrines and Practises are not to be tolerated now (as those Jewish observations were for a while, Rom. 14.) nor so long till the end of the world. For can we think, that though the Lord tendered the tender conscience of the Jews, in the observation of the difference of meates and drinks (which were sometimes his owne Ordinances) that therefore Persons must be now tolerated in the Church (for I speake not of the Civill State) in superstitious forbearing and forbidding of flesh in Popish Lents and superstitious Fridayes? &c.

Defender.

Who can tell what this Discusser would have? The Tares he would have to be Persons, not corrupt Doctrines, and Practises. And yet when he commeth to prove, that corrupt Doctrines and Practises are not to be tolerated, he proveth it from the unlawfulness of tolerating corrupt persons: for can we thinke (saith he) that persons must be now tolerated in the Church, in the superstitious forbearing or forbidding of flesh in Popish Lents and Fridayes? Such is the inconstancy of the spirits of men, whose hearts are not stayed, and
steered

steered by the Spirit of Truth, that sometimes Tares must not be corrupt Doctrines and Practises, but persons, because Tares, and so persons must be tolerated till the Harvett; not so corrupt Doctrines and Practises: And yet all the reason given, why corrupt Doctrines and Practises must not be tolerated, is this, because Persons that hold them forth must not be tolerated.

CHAP. 20.

A Reply to his twentieth Chapter what is meant by Tares?

Discusser.

The Originall word *zizania*, signifying all those weeds which spring up with the Corne, as cockle darnell, Tares &c. seemeth to imply such a kinde of people, as are commonly and generally knowne to be manifestly differing from, and opposite to, the true Worshipers of God &c.

Defender.

1. It is not true, that *zizania*, signifyeth all those weeds that grow up with the Corne. For they be a speciall weed, growing up cheifely amongst the wheat: but when it commeth to the earing, it groweth more like to Barley, yet having a narrower leafe, fatter, and rougher, and a leaner seed in a prickly barke, bearing a purple flower: as *Dioscorides* testifieth. Now this is farre from a description of all sorts of weeds, that grow up with Corne.

2. Neither is it true, that Tares are commonly and generally known as soone as they appeare. For *Hierom*, who for a time lived in *Jury*, testifieth, that *Inter triticum et zizania, quod nos appellamus lolium, quamdiu herba est, et nondum cultus venit ad spicam, gravis similitudo est, et in discernendo aut nulla aut perdifficili distantia*. Comment. Mat. Cap. 13.

Yea the Text it selfe (though the *Discusser* deny it) holdeth forth as much. For the servants of the Husbandman (in whose Feild the Tares were sown by the enemy) did not discern the tares from the wheat, till the blade was sprung up, and brought forth fruit: for then it was, and not till then, that the Tares appeared to be Tares, Mat. 13. 26. what though the Text holdeth forth no such time, wherein

wherein the servants doubted, or suspected what they were? It is like enough, they did not suspect them at all by reason of (the *grandis similitudo*) the great likenesse that was between them, whilst they were both in the blade. Which still maketh good the Exposition, that Tares are not bryars and thornes, but so like to the wheat, that till they come to earing, the one cannot be discerned from the other

Discusser.

The one appeared as soone as the other, and when the wheat put forth its blade, and fruite, the Tares were as early, they put forth themselves, and appeared also.

2. There is such a dissimilitude and unlikenesse between them, that as soone as Tares and wheat sprung up to blade and fruite, every husbandman could tell, which is wheat, and which is Tares.

Defender.

Its true, the Tares put forth their blade, as soone as did the wheat, and appeared above ground, one as early as the other: but they were so like one to an other, that the husbandmen could not tell, which was wheat, and which Tares, till the blade was grown up, and they both brought forth their fruite. And though when they both brought forth their fruite, there was no apparent dissimilitude: yet still it is evident, that at first the dissimilitude did not appeare. The Tares may therefore still stand for Hypocrites, who are so like at first unto good Christians, that they cannot easily be discerned one from another, till in processe of time, the difference of the fruite discover them.

Discusser.

But when was it that the House-holder gave charge to let them alone? was it not after they appeared, and were knowne to be Tares? which should imply by this interpretation of the Answerer, that when men are discovered and knowne to be Hypocrites, yet still such a generation of Hypocrites in the Church must be let alone, and tolerated untill the Harvest, or end of the world: which is contrary to all Piety, order and safety in the Church of the Lord Jesus, as doubtlesse, the Answerer will graunt.

Defender.

If the Answerer know his owne minde as well as the Discusser doubtlesse the Answerer will not graunt, that it is contrary to all Piety

piety, and order, and safety, that hypocrites (knowne hypocrites) be tolerated in the Church till the end of the world. For though it be against the safety of the Church, when the Officers, or body of the Church prove hypocrites, (for that threatneth a dis-churching, Rev. 2. 5.) yet till the fruits of hypocrisie grow notoriously scandalous, and ripe for Church-Censure, it is not contrary to all piety, and order, & safety, to suffer them: but rather more safety to suffer them, least some of Gods own Saints, (true wheat) who for a time may degenerate and bring forth like fruit with the Tares, be plucked up with them. If foolish Virgins be cast out of the Church, the wise Virgins may be sometime found sleeping, as well as they, Mat. 25. 5.

CHAP. 21. A Reply to his Chap. 21.

What is meant by the world; and more of the Tares.

Discusser.

1. The Tares cannot signifie hypocrites in the Church; for the field wherein they do grow is interpreted by Christ himselfe to be the world, which lieth in wickednesse, and is a wilderness of wilde Beasts, Fornicators, Covetous, Idolators, &c. In this world as soone as the Lord Jesus hath sown the good seed, (the Children of the Kingdome, true Christians; or the true Church) the enemy Satan presently in the night of Secrecie, Ignorance, and Error, soweth the Tares, which are Antichristians, or false Christians. Those the Ministers and Prophets of God would straight runne to Heaven for fiery Judgements, from thence to consume them. But the Sonne of man commandeth a Permission of them, till the end of the world, when Goats and Sheep, Tares and Wheate, shall be eternally separated, &c.

Defender.

Ans. 1. It is true, Christ expoundeth the Field to be the world, ver. 38. But he meant not the wide world, but (by an usuall Trope) the Church scattered throughout the world: as Christ is said to have loved the world, Job. 3. 16, and to be the Propitiation of the finnes of the world, 1 Job. 2. 2.

Reas. 1. Else there had been no place for the servants wonder

at the appearing of the Tares. *Sir, dost not thou see good seed in thy field? from whence then hath it Tares?* ver. 27. Did ever any of the servants of Christ wonder, or saw any cause to wonder, that the world should be full of Fornicators, Idolaters, Murderers, Robbers, &c? Was it ever otherwise since the world was replenished with Inhabitants?

Reas. 2. What calling had the Ministers, or Prophets of Christ, to offer to pluck up all such notorious vicious persons out of the world? Did ever any Ministers of Christ demand such a Question of Christ; Wilt thou have us goe, and gather up all notorious vicious Persons out of the world? As they doe indeed demand the like concerning these Tares in Christs field, ver. 28.

Reas. 3. The Discusser himselve reckoneth up Goats and Sheep, as parallell with Wheat, and Tares, as generally Interpreters doe. Now evident it is, that Goats were cleane Beasts, as well as Sheep; cleane for food, yea and cleane also for sacrifice; and yet they were tolerated not onely to live in the same world, but in the same Church. For after the destruction of Antichrist, when purest times of the Church shall come, the Members of the Church shall all of them be Virgins, (none Idolaters) though some wise, and some foolish; all of them servants, though some chaste, some unprofitable: all of them cleane, though some Goats, some Sheep. And therefore the Kingdome of Heaven (that is, the Church) is at that time resembled to such a mixt state (after the ruine of Antichrist, and conversion of the Jewes) untill the coming of Christ to Judgement, *Mat. 25. 1. &c.*

Answ. 2. If the Field should be the world, and the Tares Antichristians and false Christians; it is true, Satan sowed them in Gods Field, but he sowed them in the Church. The mystery of their Iniquitie did secretly work in the very bowels of the Church, till in proceesse of time, it grew so rank and grosse, as transformed the Churches that drunke it up, into spirituall Babylon. But if Antichrist be an Apostate, and Antichristianitie Apostasie, then it was first sown in the field of the Church, and not of the wide world.

Reas. 3. It is not the will of Christ, that Antichrist and Antichristians, and Antichristianitie should be tolerated in the world, untill the end of the world. For God will put it into the hearts of faithfull Princes, (as they have given their Kingdomes to the Beast,

to) in subsesse of time to hate the whore, to leave her desolate and naked, and to burne her flesh with fire, Rev. 17. 16, 17. And after this we read of a visible state of a new *Hierusalem*, which shall flourish many yeares upon Earth, before the end of the world, Revel. Chap. 20. Chap. 21. Chap. 22.

Nevertheless, I willingly grant that the first fruits of Antichristians, and false Christians may be reckoned up amongst the Tares, which Satan sowed in the field of the Church, which afterwards grew to be Briars and Thornes, and so destructive to the wheate, that the wheate could not be suffered (if discerned) to live amongst them.

Discusser.

But Christ (the wisdom of the Father) would never in opening this Parable, so farre obscure it, as to call the Church, the world: Nor doth it agree with the nature of the Church, or Garden of Christ, to be styled the world.

Defender.

It is no impeachment to the wisdom of Christ to call his Elect Churches and Saines throughout the world, by the Name of the world; Else Paul spake not by the wisdom of Christ, when he said, God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himselfe, 1 Cor. 5. 19.

And though the Church within it selfe be a Garden, and severed from the world; yet all the Churches being scattered and dispersed throughout the world, it is no more an improper speech, to call the Church the world, then to speake of Christ as dying for the world, when he dyed for his Church.

CHAP. 22.

A Reply to his 22. Chapter: more of Tares.

Discusser.

In the former Parable, the Lord Jesus compared the kingdome of Heaven to the sowing of seed. The true Messengers of Christ are sowers, who cast the seed of the word of the Kingdome upon 4. sorts of ground; which 4. sorts of grounds, or hearts of men, cannot be supposed to be of the Church; nor

will it ever be proved, that the Church consisteth of any more sorts or natures of ground properly, but one, to wit, the honest and good ground. And the proper work of the Church concerneth the prosperitie and flourishing of this sort of ground, and not of the other three sorts.

In the field of the world then are all these sorts of grounds, High-way-side, stony, thorney Hearers, as well as the honest and good ground. And I suppose it will not be said by the Answerer, that these three sorts of bad grounds were Hypocrites or Tares in the Church.

Defender.

Ans. 1. But what if the Answerer will say so? It may be contrary to his supposall, but not to the Truth. For I demand, did not Christ himselfe (who was the chiefe Sower) did not he Preach, and sow the seed of the word to all those foure sorts of Hearers? And yet he was the Minister of Circumcision, (Rom. 15. 8.) and Preached seldome to any, but to Church-Members, Members of the Church of Israel.

Ans. 2. It's an error to say, The Church consisteth of no more sorts of Hearers, but one, the honest and good ground: for if the children of Church-members be in the Church, & of the Church, till they give occasion of rejection, then they growing up to yeares, become some of them like the High-way-side, others like the stony, others like the Thorney, as well as others like the honest and good ground.

Ans. 3. Though it be not the proper work of the Church to attend the prosperitie and flourishing of the three sorts of bad ground, to wit, whilest they remaine bad: yet it is their worke to seek the changing of the bad into good ground; that so they may come to prosper and flourish. For is it not the proper work of the Church, to bring on their children to become the sincere People of God, as well as to keep themselves in that estate? Is it not a maine Branch of their Covenant with God, that as God giveth himselfe to be a God to them, and to their seed, so they should give up themselves and their seed to be his People? Besides, hath not God given Pastours and Teachers, as well for the gathering together of the Saints, as for the edification of the body of Christ? And hath he not given the Church, and the Gospel Preached in the Church, to lye like Leaven in three Pecks of Meale till all be Leavened? Mat. 13. 33.

Ans. 4.

Ans. 4. There is not such resemblance between High-way-side ground, and good ground, as is between Tares and Whea; nor would the servants of the Husbandman ever wonder that weeds should grow in the high-way-side ground, as they do at the growing of Tares in the Field. Nor would they ever aske the Question, whether they should pluck up weeds out of the High-way-side, or stones out of the stony ground, or pluck up Thornes out of the Thorney.

CHAP. 23.

A Reply to his Chapt. 23. Still touching the Tares.

Discusser.

These Tares I shall evidently prove to be Idolaters, and in particular, properly Antichristians. For first, these Tares are such sinners, as are opposite, and contrary to the Children of the Kingdome, visibly so declared and manifest, ver. 38.

Defender.

Ans. 1. These Tares are not such sinners as are contrary to the children of the Kingdome; for then none should be opposite to them but they. For contraries are such, *quorum unum uni opponitur*. But evident it is, there be more wicked ones opposite to the children of the Kingdome, then Idolaters, and Antichristians, to wit, those notoriously scandalous wicked ones, whom the Discusser nameth in the next Chapter, Drunkards, Thieves, uncleane Persons.

Ans. 2. It is a *λῆμμα*, a begging of the Question, to say that "these Tares are such sinners, as are opposite and contrary to the children of the Kingdome, visibly so declared and manifested; For the Tares were not discerned at first, (as hath been shewed above) till the blade was sprung up, and brought forth fruit.

Discusser.

These Tares are the Children of the wicked one; which wicked one I take to be, not the Devill; for the Lord Jesus seemeth to make them distinct. The Tares (saith he) are the Children of the wicked one, or wickednesse: the Enemy that sowed them is the Devill.

Defender.

Defender. There is not much difference between light and darknes.
Ans. 1. The Devill and the wicked one, may well mean one and the same Person. For if the Devill sowed these Tares, then these Tares were the seed (and so the children) of the Devill. Why should they be called the seed of one, and the children of another?

Ans. 2. Suppose, ~~it were~~, be translated (the children) of the wicked one, or wickednesse; that style will agree to hypocrites, as well as to other Persons. Sure it is, the Lord Jesus often calleth the Scribes and Pharises, Hypocrites, (*Mat. 23.*) and he calleth them also a wicked and adulterous Generation, *Mat. 16.* And therefore still these Tares will not appeare to be others then Hypocrites.

CHAP. 24.

A Reply to his 24. Chapter, Still touching the Tares.

Discusser.

Though all Drunkards, Thieves, uncleane Persons, &c. be opposite to Gods Children, yet the opposition of the Tares here against the Children of the Kingdome, is such an opposition as fights against the religious state and Kingdome of the Lord Jesus Christ.

2. It is manifest, the Lord Jesus intendeth no other sort of sinners in this Parable, (then Antichristians) unto whom here he saith, let them alone, in Church or State. For then he should contradict other holy and blessed Ordinances, for the punishment of Offenders, both in Christian and Civill State.

For 1. In the Civill State, God hath armed Parents, Masters, Magistrates, to punish evill doers, Murderers, Quarrellers, uncleane Persons, stealers, extortioners: such ought not to be let alone, neither in lesser nor greater Families, Townes, Cities, Kingdomes, *Rom. 13.* but seasonably suppress, &c.

2. In the Kingdome of Christ, (whose Officers, Lawes, punishments, weapons, are all Spirituall and of a Soule-nature) he will not have Antichristian Idolaters, Extortioners, Covetous, &c. to be let alone, but the uncleane Lepers to be thrust forth, &c.

Therefore if neither the Offenders against the Civill Lawes, State, and Peace, ought to be let alone, nor the Spirituall State, the Church ought to beare with them that are evill, *Rom. 2.*

I conclude, that these Tares are sinners of another nature, Idolaters, false Worshippers, Antichristians, who without discouragement to true Christians, must be let alone, and permitted in the world to grow up until the great Harvest.

Defenders.

Ans. 1. As all wicked Persons be opposite to Gods children, (for the children of the Kingdome of Light, and the children of the Kingdome of darknesse, cannot but be opposite;) so the opposition that is in all the wicked against the children of God, doth fight against the religious state and Kingdome of the Lord Jesus. For such as stand for the Kingdome of Satan, (as all wicked men doe) they stand in opposition to the Kingdome of Christ. No man can serve two Masters; If he cleave to the one, he standeth in enmitie to the other, *Mat. 6. 24.*

Ans. 2. It followeth not, that because Christ biddeth his Ministers, Let the wicked alone in Church or State; That therefore he intendeth no other then Antichristian Idolaters: Neither should Christ contradict any Ordinance of his own for the punishment of Offenders, both in Christian and Civill State, though he should command other offenders to be let alone besides Antichristians. For no Ordinance or Law of God, nor just Law of man, commandeth the rooting out of hypocrites, either by Civill, or Church-censure, though the Church be bound to endeavour as much (as in them lyeth) to heale their hypocrisie.

Ans. 3. Neither is it true, that Antichristians are to be let alone by the Ordinance of Christ, till the end of the world. For what if the members of a Christian Church shall some of them Apostate to Antichristian Superstition and Idolatry, (as often falleth out by the seduction of the Emisaries of Babel) doth the Ordinance of Christ binde the hands of the Church (of which they are Members) to let them alone? In chapter 19. The Discusser himself would not have the superstitious observation of Lent-Fasts to be let alone; And surely, Christ ordained by his blessed Apostle Paul, that if any Brother proved an Idolater, (whether Pagan, or Antichristian) such an one should be cast out by excommunication, *1 Cor. 5. 11.*

Besides, What if any Antichristian Persons out of zeale to the Catholick Cause, and out of conscience to the command of their Superiours,

Superiours, should seeke to destroy the King and Parliamenr, (as hath more then once or twice been attempted;) should such an one by any ordinance of Christ be let alone in the Civill State? Moreover, if Popish Priests and Jesuites be rightly expounded to be the Rivers and Fountaines of water which drive the dead Sea of Antichristian pollution up and downe all Nations in Europe: and if they by the Ordinance of Christ, be (in some cases) to drinke blond, (for they are worthy) then they are not to be let alone, but duely suppressed, and cut off from conveying up and downe their Idolatrous, Hereticall, and Seditious wickednesse, Rev. 16. 4. to 7.

CHAP. 25.

A Reply to his 25. Chapter; Still discussing the meaning of the Tares.

THirdly, The Tares cannot be hypocrites, is as cleare as the Light, because they, when they are discovered, and seeme to be Tares, are not to be let alone to the Angels in the end of the world, but are to be purged out by the Governours of the Church, with the whole Church.

Defender.

This objection hath been answered above, and let it be againe denied (till the Discussor prove the contrary, which will never be) That hypocrites when they appeare to be hypocrites, (and yet no worse then Tares) are to be purged out by the Government of the Church. It is true, if Hypocrites having a forme of Godlinesse, and yet denying the power thereof, doe breake forth into such notorious scandalous Fruits of Hypocrisie, as tend to the leavening of the whole lumpe, they may then justly be proceeded against by the Government of the Church. But otherwise, if the Church proceed against an Hypocrite, as such, meerely for his hypocrisie, for want of life and power of Godlinesse in his duties, they may soone roote out, sometime or other, the best wheate in Gods Field, and the sweetest Flowers in his Garden, who sometimes loose their sathesse and sweetnesse for a season.

Discussor.

Discusser.

Every Brother that walketh disorderly is to be with-drawn; and separated from.

Defender.

True: But, who is a Brother that walketh disorderly? Not every Hypocrite, but onely such, who either walke inordinately without a calling (*ἀνεκ κλήσεως*), or idely and negligently in his calling. For so the context carrieth it, in the words alluded to 2 Thess. 3. 6. But that is not the case of every Hipocrite: of whom their are many that follow their callings, and are so farre from being burthensome to others by their idlenesse, that they are even choaked with the cares and busineses of this world, and yet are not behinde in liberall contributions to pious uses.

CHAP. 26. A Reply to his Chap. 26.

Touching the danger of letting alone AntiChristians.

Discusser.

If any imagine, that the Antichristians being let alone may doe a world of mischief before the worlds end, by the infection of others.

I Answer, 1. The Civill State keepeth it selfe with a Civill sword: let Civill offences be punished: and yet let their worship and Consciences be tolerated.

2. The Church hath a thousand bucklers and weapons, able to break downe the strongest bould (2 Cor. 10.) and so to defend it selfe against the gates of earth or hell.

3. The Lord knoweth who are his: his chosen cannot finally be deceived.

Lastly the Lord Jesus himselfe in this Parable giveth 2. Reasons able to content and satisfie our hearts.

First, least the good wheat be pluckt up out of the feild of the world. Gods People, the good wheat are generally pluckt, and persecuted, as well as the vilest Idolaters, whether Jewes or Antichristians, which the Lord Jesus seemeth here to foretell.

Second reason is, when the world is ripe in sinne, in the sinnes of Antichristianisme, those mighty Angells of God will come with their sharpe sickles

sickles, and downe with them, And bundle them up for everlasting burnings, then shall the man of sin be consumed by the breath of the mouth of the Lord Jesus &c.

Defender.

Reply, 1. To his first Answer: It is true, the Civill State keepeth it selfe with a Civill sword, if Civill offences be punished. But when he would have their worship & Consciences tolerated, what if their worship and Consciences incite them to Civill offences? How shall then the Civill State keepe it selfe safe with a Civill Sword.

As suppose a man that worshippeth the Beast, and maketh Conscience of obeying his commandements, shall I thinke himselfe bound to subvert the Civill Prince, or State, who is excommunicated by the Beast? If such a man must be tolerated in his worship, and Conscience, what sword can provide for the safety of such a Prince or State?

Reply.

2. To his second Answer, It is true, the Church wanteth no Armories to defend it self, and amongst others, excommunication. But if their members be leavened with Antichristian Idolatry and superstition, and yet must be tolerated in their Idolatrous and superstitious worship, will not a little leaven (so tolerated) leaven the whole lump? And how then is the safety of the Church guarded?

Reply.

3. To his 3. Answer. It is true the Lord knoweth who are his: and none of his Elect shall perish. But nevertheless, Is it not a tempting of God, to presume upon Gods Election for our salvation, and to neglect the meanes of our preservation? In like case, Paul knew by revelation, that all his fellow passengers in the ship should be saved: but yet he professed that if the Marriners went out of the ship, they could not be saved Acts, 27. 24, with 31. So is it here, The Elect of God shall be saved: but yet if Idolaters, and Seducers be tolerated (as Jezabell was in Tyjaria) to seduce the servants of Christ to pollution and Apostacy, the Church will stand guilty before God of the seduction and corruption of the people of God.

Reply.

Reply.

4. To his 4. Answer (the 2. Reasons alledged by him out of the Text:) To the first: There is no feare of plucking up the wheat, by rooting out Idolaters, and Seducers. If any of Gods People should fall into Idolatry, and Apostacy, yea and should prove an instrument to seduce others also into the like wickedness: yet the censures inflicted on them, would be blessed of God to their recovery, & healing: yea and if they were cut off by the Civill sword, yet the example and terrour of their punishment, would be blessed of God to preserve their brethren: who would all of them heare and feare, and doe no more such wickedness. Neither is the just punishment of such, any just pretence to punish the innocent lambs of Christ.

Reply.

To the Second Reason out of the Parable, It may justly be Replyed, that the charge given to the Angells to execute vengeance on the last day upon such Idolaters, if that were sufficient to plead for the toleration of Idolaters, It would as well plead for the toleration of Murtherers, Robbers, Adulterers, Extortioners &c. for all these will the holy and mighty Angells of God gather into bundles at the last day, and cast them into everlasting burnings.

The place in 2. Thess. 2. doth not say, that the man of sin shall then be consumed with the breath of the mouth of the Lord Jesus: for he shall begin to be consumed long before, by all the seven vials of the wrath of God, Revel. 16. which have bin, and will be in pouring out many ages, before the great Harvest, of the end of the world. Yea I beleive also, He shall be destroyed many ages before then: as the Apostle John foretelleth in Chap. 20. 2. 1. 2. 3. Of the Revelation. And though it be translated, (in 2. Thess. 2. 8.) The Lord shall destroy him with the brightnesse of his coming: yet the word is, *ἐν τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ* and *ἐν τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ* doth as well, and more firstly signifie Presence, then coming. The Lord will destroy Antichrist with the brightnesse of his Presence in his sacred and Civill Ordinances, sundry ages before the brightnesse of his coming to Judgement. Otherwise we should set John & Paul at variance, who spake by one and the same Spirit of Truth.

Reply

CHAP. 27.

A Reply to his 27. Chap.

Discussing a doubt, how Ministers may be bidden to let
Antichristians alone in the Civil State.

Discusser.

If it be objected, These servants, whom the Householder commandeth
 to let the Tares alone, seeme to be Ministers or Messengers of the Gospel:
 How shall it belong to them to pluck up the Tares, or to let them alone,
 if by the Field be meant the world?

Ans. The Apostles, and in them all that succeed them, received from the
 Lord a threefold charge.

1. To let them alone, and not to pluck them up by Prayer to God for
 their present temporall destruction.
2. Not to prophesy or denounce a present destruction, or extirpation of all
 false Professors of the Name of Christ. Tis true many sore and fearefull
 plagues are poured out upon the Roman Emperors, and Roman Popes,
 yet not to their utter extirpation untill the Harvest.

3. Not to pluck them up, by stirring up Civil Magistrates and powers,
 to punish and persecute all such persons out of their dominions, as worship
 not the true God according to his revealed will in Christ Jesus.

Tis true, Elijah thus stirred up Ahab to kill all the Priests and Pro-
 phets of Baal: but that was in the figurative state of the Land of Cana-
 an, not to be matcht or paralleld by any other State (but the Spiritual
 State, or Church of Christ) in all the world, putting the false Prophets
 Spiritually to death, by the two-edged sword, and power of the Lord Jesus,
 as that Church of Israel did corporally.

Defender.

These 3 Interpretations of let them alone, are all of them so
 many evasions, (slippery evasions) sought out by the subtle wit of
 man, to winde out from under the Authority of the Truth, and
 word of Christ,

For 1. Why should not the Ministers of Christ Pray, either
 to pluck them up out of their Antichristian Idolatryes, or else to
 pluck them up, as the Plantations which our Heavenly Father
 hath not planted? He that may Pray daily for the comming of
 Christ

Christs Kingdome, He may, and doth, and ought to pray for the comming downe of all opposite Kingdomes. The Saints under the Altar that prayed against the delay of vengeance on the Roman Emperors, (Revel. 6. 10.) may more justly pray against the delay of vengeance on the Roman Antichrists.

What though the State of the Roman Antichristians was to continue for sundry ages before their finall extirpation? Yet they were to expect vials of Gods indignation to roote them out by a gradual extirpation in sundry of their cheife branches, and pillars, long before the extirpation of their whole Kingdome.

And what though the Saints in old Babel were to pray for the Peace of the City, as wherein themselves might finde Peace? Yet the Saints that live not in such Antichristian Territoryes, they may safely pray for the hastning of the redemption of their brethren out of the Antichristian bondage, and there withall pray for the hastning of the ruine, and desolation of the Antichristian Kingdome.

Besides, Certaine It is from the Word of Truth, that the Antichristian Kingdome shall be destroyed, and rooted up by Christian Princes and States long before the great Harvelt of the end of the world, as hath been shewen a bove. And either such Princes must performe this great worke without Prayer (and then it were not sanctified to God: 1 Tim. 2. 15.) Or if it be a sacrifice sanctified to God, they must pray for their desolation before they inflict it. And all the seven Angells, who powre out their vials on the Antichristian State, tending to the rooting of it out by degrees, They either pray for the success of the vengeance of their vials, or else they doe not powre them out in faith: which were contrary to the spirit of such holy Saints, who come out of the Temple opened in Heaven, and are clothed with pure and white linnen, and have their breasts girded with golden girdles, Rev. 15. 6.

2. If John the Apostle have Prophecied and denounced the destruction and extirpation of Antichristian Idolaters, and their whole State, why may not a Minister and Messenger of Christ (according to the measure of light received) open those Prophecies, and apply them with severe threatnings, against thme and their State?

Yes, but they may not apply, or denounce them to their present destruction or extirpation.

Yes

Yes to the present destruction of some or other Antichristian Idolaters in every age, though the State may continue (waiting) till the time appointed. I might as truly be said, the Ministers of Christ are forbidden to denounce present or speedy destruction to any murderers, whoremongers, Tyrants, extortioners, because though some of them may fall under many sore and fearful plagues yet there will never want a company of such wicked doers, till the Great Harvest, the end of the world.

Besides what if a messenger of Christ should not denounce present destruction, yet he cannot be said to let them alone, who is hewing at them to bring them to destruction many years before. It is not every stroke with an Axe that felleth an Oake; it may be not a hundred, not a thousand strokes, yet no stroke is lost that maketh way for the felling of it at the last. Neither can he be said to let the Tree alone, that striketh and beweth at it every day. So he that beweth at the Antichristian State every day by Prayer, and Preaching. He doth not let it alone, though it may stand many a year after. It will fall the sooner, and with more facility for every stroke.

10. Nor can it be the meaning of Christ, in commanding his Ministers to let the Tares alone, to forbid them to stir up Princes and States, to the rooting out of Antichristian Idolaters, and all such false worshippers, as destroy the Truth and Religion of the Lord Jesus. For amongst all the Angels, that poured out their vials upon the Antichristian State, it is not credible, that none of them should be Messengers of the Gospel. And when the ten Kings shall burn the City of Rome, and leave it desolate and naked, it is not credible that they will do it without some excitement from the Angels, no more then the Angels poured out their vials, till they were stirred up by a great voice out of the Temple, *Revelations*, 16. 1.

It is an evasion as groundless as the former, that *Elijah* stirring up of *Ahab* to kill all the Priests and Prophets of *Beel*, was figurative.

For all Figures in the Old Testament have their Accomplishment in the New. Now evident it is, *Ahab* (an Apostate Idolater) was no Type of Christ: nor was *Israel* (after their Apostacy) a Type of the Church of Christ. A Tabernacle it was, but not a Tabernacle.

nacle of Christ: *Abolab* but not *Abolibab*. To make this act in *Israel* a Type of Christs act in Christian State, or Church, is to make darknesse a type of light. Ceremoniall Lawes were generally Typicall: not so *Moses* his Judicialls, especially those which had in them morall equity.

It is Morall equity, That Blasphemers, and Apostate Idolaters, seducing others to Idolatry, should be put to death, *Levit.* 24. 16. *Deut.* 13. 5. *Abab* forfeited his owne life because he did not put *Bembadad* to death for his blasphemy. 1 *Kings*, 20. 23, 28. and ver. 42. yet *Bembadad* was no *Israelite*, nor was his blasphemy bleched out in the Land of *Israel*: but the externall equity of that Judiciall Law of *Moses* was of morall force, and bindeth all Princes to expresse that zeale, and indignation, both against blasphemy, in such as fall under their just power, which *Abab* neglected; and against seduction to Idolatry, which *Abab* executed, or else *Elijah*, or some others, by his consent.

But before I leave this dispute, touching the meaning of those words, Let them alone, let me add another Interpretation, which I see doth rather more satisfie others, and it may wel stand. Let them alone, is not a word of precept by way of Ordinance: But a word of permission by way of Providence. God in his Providence will permit some or other Tares ever to be found in his Church to the last Judgement. Which yet he would not have his servants offended at: For them he will pluck up by his Angells at the last Harvest.

CHAP. 28.

A Reply to his 28th Chapter: Which is a Recaptulation of what Points the Discusser supposeth, He hath proved in opening this Parable.

Defender.

The Discusser in this Chapter, is onely a Rehearser of what he conceiveth himselfe to have evidently demonstrated to the Conscience, from Chap. eighteene, to this Chapter twentieight: Five Points Negatively: and Five Points Affirmatively. But because what

what he rehearseth hath been reverled in the Reply to those severall Chapters, I will not *Actum Agere*, nor *Dictum dicere*.

C H A P. 29.

A Reply to his twentieth Chapter, Discussing the Text in Matth. 15. 14.

Letter.

The second Scripture brought against such Persecution for Cause of Conscience, is Matth. 15. 14. where the Disciples being troubled at the Pharises carriage towards the Lord Jesus, and his Doctrine, and relating how they were offended at him, The Lord Jesus commandeth his Disciples to Let them alone, and giveth this Reason, that the blind lead the blind, and both should fall into the ditch.

Ans. of the Letter.

Christ speaketh not there to publick Officers, whether in Church or Common-wealth, but to his private Disciples concerning the Pharises, over whom they had no power.

And the command he giveth to Let them alone is spoken in regard of troubling themselves, or regarding the offence which they tooke at the wholesome Doctrine of the Gospel. As who should say, Though they be offended at this wholesome saying of mine, yet doe not you feare their feare, nor be troubled at their offence, which they take at my Doctrine, not out of sound Judgement, but out of blindness. But this maketh nothing to the cause in hand.

Discusser.

To passe by this Assertion of the privacy of the Apostles, in that the Lord Jesus, commanded to Let them alone, that is, not onely to be offended themselves, but not to meddle with them, It appeareth it was no Ordinance of God, nor of Christ, for his Disciples to have gone further, and have complained to, and excited, the Civill Magistrate to his duty. Which if it had been an Ordinance of God, and Christ, either for the vindicating of Christs Doctrine, or the recovering of the Pharises, or the preserving of others from infection, the Lord Jesus would never have commanded them to omit that, which it could have tended to these holy ends.

Defender

Defender.

Reply 1. To passe by the Assertion of the Privacy of the Apostles, It is not an Act of courtesie, and loathnesse to strive, but out of defect of just pretence to make any colourable exception against it. For though the Apostles were called to a publique Ministry, *Matth. 10.* yet it seemeth, not as then to a constant office, but to a transient Administration *pro illa vice*, for that time. Their constant calling required to attend continually upon Christs Ministry, to prepare and ripen them for the publique constant office which they were to be called to, after Christs Resurrection, *Acts 1. 21, 22.*

Besides in that transient Administration they were not sent to the Scribes and Pharises, (who were no bitter then Wolves and Foxes,) but to the lost sheepe of the House of Israel, *Matth. 10. 6.* And therefore the Apostles not being sent to the Scribes and Pharises, they had no power over them, but stood as private men to them.

Reply 2. And as they had no calling, nor power to correct or censure them themselves: so neither had they a calling to excite the civill Magistrate against them. For first it was no just cause for the civill Magistrate to punish the Pharises, for that they tooke unjust offence against Christs wholesome doctrine.

For neither was the doctrine it selfe a fundamentall truth: nor was their offence against it, a fundamentall error, though it was dangerous. Besides the civill Magistrates had no Law established about doctrines, or offences of that nature. And therefore they could take no judiciall cognizance of any complaint presented to them about the same.

Moreover our Saviour who sent forth his Apostles to preach to the lost sheepe of the house of Israel, gave them a charge of caution to beware how they medled with Scribes and Pharises, Behold, (saith he) I send you forth as sheepe among wolves: Be ye therefore wise as serpents, & innocent as doves, Beware of men, &c. *Mat. 10. 16, 17.*

The Apostles therefore having received this caution could not meddle with the Scribes and Pharises, but trespasse against this rule of serpentine prudence: as much as for a flocke of lambes to complaine to a kennell of wolves, of the wolves out-rage. Yea, Christ himselfe was sparing to reprove them himselfe (though cal-

led to a publicke Ministry,) till the last yeare of his Ministry, when his houre was comming of departure out of the world; as knowing, they would not be able to beare it, and their exasperation might have been some hinderance to the free passage of his Ministry, before his houre was come.

CHAP. 30. A Reply to his Chap. 30.

Discusser.

IF it be said, neither the Roman Cæsar, nor Herod, nor Pilate, knew ought of the true God, or of Christ: and it had been in vaine to have made complaint to them, who were not fit, and competent, but ignorant, and opposite Judges.

Ans. 1. This removeth the stumbling block of Pauls appeale to Cæsar: which since he could not doe in common sence, as to a competent Judge in such cases, &c. It must needes follow, his appeale was meere in respect of his civill wrongs, &c.

Ans. 2. If it had been an Ordinance of God: that all civill Magistrates were bound to judge in causes spirituall, and Christian, (as to suppress Herefies, to defend the Faith of Jesus:) although that Cæsar, Herod, and Pontius Pilate, were ignorant, wicked and opposite Judges: yet Christ and his Disciples should have gone as farre as lay in their power for redressing of evill, and left it in the Magistrates hands.

Ans. 3. If it had been the holy will of God to have established the Doctrine and Kingdome of his Sonne this way, he would have furnished Kingdomes and Common-wealths with many good and gracious Magistrates, to have fitted them for it.

Defender.

Reply 1. to Ans. 1. Pauls appeale to Cæsar, was about the wrongs done unto the Jewes, Acts 25. 10. The wrongs to them were not onely civill, but Church-offences, which Paul denied: Neither against the Law of the Jewes (saith he) nor against the Temple, nor against Cæsar, have I offended any thing at all, ver. 8. Festus demanded if he would goe up to Hierusalem, there to be judged of these things? ver. 9. These things were matters of Religion, as well as civill offences. To offend against the Law of the Jewes, and against the Temple, were offences against Religion: to offend against Cæsar was a civill offence. To be judged of these things, Paul declineth

declineth the Court at *Hierusalem*, (as being unjustly prejudiced against him:) But professing his owne innocency, and subjection to just judgement, He appealeth to *Cæsars* judgement seate, ver. 10, 11. wherein three or foure things doe evidently appeare.

1. That a man may be such an offender in matters of Religion (against the Law of God, against the Church, as well as in civill matters against *Cæsar*) as to be worthy of death.

This *Paul* presupposeth, ver. 8, 9, 10.

2. That *Paul*, or any other such like servant of Christ, If he should commit any such offence, he wou'd not refuse judgement unto death, ver. 11.

3. That for the Judgement of his person in these causes, (whether ecclesiasticall or civill,) It is lawfull in some cases to appeale, to a civill, though a *Pagan* Magistrate. In some cases I say, as where both these concur, to wit. 1. That Church-officers, are maliciously prejudiced against a man, and inferiour civil Courts incline to them. 2. That a man be called in question amongst them in capitall causes, which concerne his life.

But a fourth thing which appeareth from *Pauls* appeale is this, That the civill Magistrate, whether *Christian*, or *Pagan*, may and ought to be so well acquainted, not onely with civill causes, but also with causes of Religion, especially such as concerne life, as to be able to judge, though not of all questions, yet of capitall offences, against Religion, as well as against the civill State.

Reply 2. to *Ans. 2.* The Marginall Note, seemeth to imply a contradiction to it selfe, for thus it speaketh, *Civill Magistrates were never appointed by God, Defenders of the Faith of Jesus.* And againe, *Every one is bound to put forth himselfe to his utmost power in Gods Businesse:* Surely, if every one be bound to put forth himselfe to his utmost power in Gods Businesse, then civill Magistrates are bound to put forth their civill power, in defending the Faith of Jesus.

Neither will it henceforth follow, That either Christ, or his Disciples were bound to complaine to *Cæsar*, or to *Herod*, or to *Pontius Pilate*, against the Heresies of the Pharises. For though all Magistrates, even *Pagans* ought to informe themselves in the matters of Faith and of Christian Religion, (that they may observe and preserve it) and it will be a destructive sinne to them and

their States, if they doe neglect it, (*Psalm. 2. 10, 11, 12.*) Yet it may be safer for a Christian man being oppressed in Inferiour Courts of hereticall malignant Judges to appeale from them unto *Pagan* Princes in his owne just defence, then to make complaint to malignant hereticall Judges, or to *Pagan* Princes, against heresies, or hereticall false Teachers. Christ sent out his Disciples, as sheepe amongst wolves: and therefore instructed them, *to be wise as serpents, and innocent as doves, Matth. 10. 16.* Now it is no part of wisdom for a sheepe of Christ to complaine to a kennell of wolves, That amongst the wolves, there be some of their company doe make havocke of the sheepe, leading them aside into damnable heresies. If a poore sheepe should attempt such a thing, would not the whole kennell of wolves arise up against him, as a troubler of their State, that when he enjoyeth peace himselfe, (they trouble not him,) yet he will needes be so busie as to trouble them?

And therefore we deny, that it had tended to the defence of the Faith of Jesus, or to the suppressing Heresies, for Christ and his Disciples to have complained to *Herod, Pilate, Caesar*, of the heresies of the Pharises. It had rather tended to the disturbance and suppression of the Faith of Jesus, by provoking the malice of the Pharises, and by disquieting civill Thrones with feares and jealousies of a new Kingdome springing up amongst them. Besides, it had been altogether preposterous, to make use of the civill power, for the first publishing of the Gospell of peace. It was necessary the Gospell should first be knowne, and received, and beleaved, and professed, before any could be complained of, for Apostacy from it into Heresie, or seducement of others into such wickedness.

Reply 3. to Anf. 3. We doe not say, It is the holy Will and Purpose of God, to establish the Doctrine and Kingdome of his Sonne (our Lord Jesus) onely this way, to wit, by the helpe of civill Authority. For it is his Will also, to magnifie his Power, in establishing the same, by a contrary way, even by the sufferings (patient sufferings) of his Saints, and by the bloody swords of persecuting Magistrates, *Revel. 12. 11.* So that Christ need not to send good and gracious Magistrates, as if for want of them, the Christian Faith and Religion would fall to the ground: for it hath

hath spread and flourished under fiery and cruell persecution. But yet this hindreth not, but that it is the duty of Magistrates to know the Sonne, and to kisse him, to acknowledge his Kingdome, and submit their Thrones and Crownes to it, to love his truth, and to be *nursing Fathers to his Church*, *Isai. 49. 23.* which how they can doe, and yet not be Defenders of the Faith of Jesus, I doe not understand.

CHAP. 31.

A Reply to his thirteenth Chapter, discussing by the way, the Text in Isai. 49. 23.

Discusser.

1. **T**hat place of Isaiah 49. 23. will appeare to be farre from proving such Kings and Queenes Judges of Ecclesiasticall causes. And if not Judges, they may not punish.
2. In spirituall things, themselves are subject to the Church, shall like the dust of the Churches feet, as is there exprest. How then shall those Kings and Queenes be Supream Governours of the Church?
3. Gods Israel of old being earnest for a King, an Arme of flesh, God gave them Saul in his anger, and tooke him away in his wrath. So God will take away such Princes in his wrath; that so as David succeeded Saul, so Christ Jesus in his spirituall Power may for ever be advanced.

Defender.

Reply 1. We doe not alledge that place in *Isaiah*, to prove Kings and Queenes to be Judges of Ecclesiasticall causes: but to be providers for the Churches well-being, and protectours of it. For so much the very phrase of nursing Fathers, and Mothers, doth necessarily import. But if they be Protectours of the Church, and providers of the well-being of it, then are they also Defenders of the faith of it: so farre as their defence (in a way of God) is dispensable. So Magistrates are also called Shepherds of the people (as well as Ministers) *Ezec. 34.* Now it is a part of a Shepherds protection of his sheepe, to drive away wolves from sheepe-folds. And it is the like part of good Magistrates to drive away false Prophets from the Churches, whom our Saviour calleth ravening wolves, *Matth. 7. 15.*

But

But (saith he) *Magistrates are not Judges of Ecclesiasticall causes: and if not Judges, they may not punish.*

Answ. There is a three-fold Judgement. 1. A Judgement of private spirituall Discretion: and so *a spirituall man judgeth all things*, 1 Cor. 2. 15. and so may a Magistrate judge also, if he be a spirituall man.

2. There is *Judicium Propheticum*, A propheticall Judgement, whereby the Prophets having received a greater gift of spirituall discerning of the things of God, and an office to declare the same, doe judge of Doctrins with Authority. *Let the Prophets judge*, 2 Cor. 14. 29. 32. And this the Ministeriall Judgement of the Church: but here the Magistrates Judgement doth not interpose, as a Magistrate, but as a Brother.

3. There is *Judicium Politicum*, the Judgement of civill power, whereby a Magistrate being called of God to provide, that his people may lead a peaceable life in godlinesse and honesty, he therefore is called to discerne, not onely what is honesty or righteousness before men, but what is godlinesse also before the Lord, & accordingly judgeth of godly & ungodly doctrines & practises, so far as tendeth to the upholding of publicke Peace. For it is evident in the Scriptures of the New-Testament, that when Magistrates were so blindly devout, and superstitious, as to give their Kingdomes unto the Beast, (as Rev. 17. 12, 13.) and so to tolerate the publicke worship of Images, and other Idolls, they thereby overthrew the civill Peace of their Common-wealth. For to punish their ungodlinesse, it was, that God opened a way for the *Turkes* to breake out and destroy the 3^d part of *Christendome*, Rev. 9. 14. to 21.

Reply 2. Both these may well stand together, that Magistrates may be subject to the Church, and licke the dust of her feet, & yet be supream Governours of the Church also. In spirituall matters, and in the right administration of them, the Magistrates are subject to the Church. But in civill matters, and in corrupt administration of Church-Affaires, (so farre corrupt, as tendeth to the disturbance of civill Peace, there the Magistrates are supream Governours even over Churches also, in their owne Dominions.

Reply 3. It was no sinne in *Israel* of old to aske a King, but to aske him before the time appointed, and to aske him in a tumultuous manner, (with rejection of *Samuel*, and to aske him for carnall

carnall and prophane ends, that they might belike to all other Nations, whom God did not approve they should affect to be like unto. Otherwise had they tarried Gods time, God had appointed to give them a King out of the Tribe of Judah, *Gen. 49. 10.* It is true, God tooke away *Saul* in his wrath, but not for exercising civill Power against spirituall wickednesse; for he did justly exercise it against Witches: but for other well-knowne notorious wickednesse. And as for *David*, we doe not reade, that he did exercise any spirituall Power, as a King, but as a Prophet.

CHAP. 32. A Reply to his Chap. 32.

Discusser.

THough for the present, the punishment of corrupt Teachers (as the Scribes and Pharises were) be deferred: yet their waiteth for them on higher pitch of punishment, then any Corporall can reach unto.

As 1. Starke Blindnesse, &c.

2. Incurable Blindnesse, &c.

3. Their end is the Ditch, &c.

4. The Leaders of others into the ditch shall find their owne ruine horrible, and the ruine of their followers eternally galling & tormenting.

Defender.

The Discusser himselfe knoweth, and accordingly expresth himselfe in his next words, That it is the like case of all sinners, and of all malefactours: their punishment in hell will be more horrible and full of torment, then can be inflicted in this world. And yet the State is often bound to punish them, and in many cases by death it selfe.

Discusser.

Be it so: But what is this to a blind Pharisee, resisting the Doctrine of Christ? who hapily may be as good a Subject, and as peaceable, and profitable to the civill State as any, &c.

Defender.

But what is this to the question in hand? we doe not hold it lawfull for a Christian Magistrate, to compell by civill sword either Pharisee, or any Jew, or Pagan, to professe the Religion, or Doctrine of the Lord Jesus, much lesse doe we thinke it meet, for a private Christian to provoke either Jewish or Pagan Magistrates

to compell Pharises to submit to the Doctrine or Religion of Christ Jesus. And therefore all these Chapters from 29. to 35. (seven Chapters in all) tending to prove that Christs Disciples were to let the Pharises alone in this way, are but so many empty flourishes, beating the aire, & playing with a shadow. And yet the rest of the Chapters which remaine must not passe without some Advertisement of such passages in them, as doe corrupt the truth of Christ. How the Pharises can be as good subjects, and as peaceable, and profitable to the civill State as any, who yet destroyed the civill State, by destroying Christ; let any but a blind conscience judge.

CHAP. 33.

Discusser.

I*t is truth, The mischief of a blind Pharises blind guidance, is greater then if he acted treasons, murders, &c. And the losse of one soule by his seduction, is a greater mischief, then if he blew up Parliaments, or cut the throats of Kings and Emperours, &c.*

And therefore a firme justice, that requires an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, life for life, calleth also soule for soule. But that no civill sword can inflict, but the Lord Jesus onely.

Defender.

Reply 1. But he that corrupteth a soule with a corrupt religion, or worship, layeth a spreading leaven, which corrupteth the State. The Idolatry began in the House of Micah, corrupted Laish, Judges chap. 17. and chap. 18. And that was the beginning of sinne to the Daughter of Zion, Micah 1. 13. And that Apostacy was the captivity of the Land. As in the New-Testament, the worship of Images was the advancement of the Turkes, and the ruine of Christian States, Rev. 9. 14. to 21. When therefore the corruption, or destruction of soules, is a destruction also of lives, liberties, estates of men, *lex talionis* calleth for, not onely soule for soule, but life for life.

Reply 2. False Prophets in the Old-Testament did but corrupt the soules of some, and it may be did not corrupt them neither, but attempted it onely. And yet amongst Gods people, where *lex talionis* was much attended, the Law was, *Thine eye shall not spare him*

him, Deut. 13. The reason of which execution is not fetched from any typicall holinesse of the Land: but from the dangerous wickednesse of the attempt, to thrust away a soule from God, which is a greater injury, then to deprive a man of bodily life.

Discusser.

But dead men cannot die, nor be infected. Naturall men, the civill State, the world, are dead in sinne, &c.

Defender.

Reply 1. Dead men may be made worse, by corrupt Teachers, two-fold more the children of hell then before, Matth. 23. 15. And therefore such as so corrupt them, are worthy in a way of due proceeding of a two-fold death.

Reply 2. Such as professe the truth of the Doctrine and Worship of Christ, they live a kind of spirituall life, though not such as accompanieth salvation. Else how are false Teachers, and such as are led by them, said to be twice dead, plucked up by the roots? Jude ver. 12. And therefore it is not true, that such as being in a naturall state, are dead in sinne, cannot be infected, nor die againe.

Discusser.

As in the common infection of the plague, so in the infection of heresie, none can be stricke deadly, but whom God hath therunto ordained, &c.

Defender.

Reply 1. No more can any man be murdered, but whom God hath ordained therunto. But it is a prophane sacriledge to excuse, or alleviate the punishment of sinne by Gods eternall predestination. Was the sinne of Herod, or the Jewes, or of Pontius Pilate any whit thelesse, because they did nothing against Christ, but what the hand of God and his Counsell had fore-determined to be done? Acts 4. 29. Sure it is, Christ aggravateth the sinne of Judas, and of the High-Priests, and Elders of the Jewes by this Argument, that Pilate could doe nothing against him, but as it was given him from above. Therefore (saith he) he that delivered me to thee, hath the greater sinne, John 19. 11.

Reply 2. The Discusser himselfe acknowledgeth, That though in a common plague or infection, none are smitten, or die, but such as are ordained therunto: yet it is not onely every mans duty, but the common duty of the Magistrates to prevent infection, and to preserve the common health of the place, by removing infectious persons into solitary tabernacles.

K

Discusser.

Discusser.

True: but the meanes God hath appointed for preservation from spirituall infection and perdition, are spirituall, such as God directeth to Rev. 2. Tit. 3. 10, 11. Rom. 16. 17. But the Lord Jesus never appointed the civill sword for either Antidote, or Remedy, as an addition to those Spirituall. The Remedy which God prescribed to the Angell of the Church of Pergamus, It were a Babylonish confusion to interpret it, as sent to the Governour of the City of Pergamus.

Defender.

Subordinata, and so *Coordinata non pugnant*. It is true, Christ hath appointed spirituall meanes for the avoiding and preventing the infection of heresies; so hath he also for the preventing and avoiding all offences in Church-members. But that hindreth not the lawfull and necessary use of a civill sword for the punishment of some such offences, as are subject to Church-censure. If indeed the Ordinances of Christ in the Church doe prevaile to the avoiding and healing of heresies, there is no need of the civill sword for that end. But it often falleth out otherwise: as

1. That when the Church hath cast out an Heretick, yet he still remaineth obstinate, and proceedeth to seduce, and destroy the faith of some, (it may be of many:) as did Hymeneus and Philetus, 2 Tim. 2. 17, 18. If the Magistrates sword doe here rust in the scabbard, such leaven may leaven the whole Masse of a City, or Countrey; As by this meanes *Arrianisme* leavened the world by the indulgence of *Constantius*; *Ingemuit Orbis Christianus*, & *miratus est factum se esse Arrianum*.

2. It may be the Heretick was never any member of the Church, and then though the Church may lay in some *Antidotes*, and *Purges*, to preserve, or recover their Members: yet how shall they succour such as are not subject to their censures? Or how shall they prevent the spreading of this noisome leprosie in private *Conventicles*?

But the Lord Jesus never appointed the civill sword for an Antidote, or Remedy in such a case.

Answer. It is evident the civill sword was appointed for a remedy in this case, Deut. 13. And appointed it was, by that Angell of Gods presence, whom God promised to send with his people, as being unwilling to goe along with them himselve, Exod. 33. 2, 3.

And

And that Angell was Christ, whom they tempted in the wilderness, 1 Cor. 10. 9. And therefore it cannot truly be said, that the Lord Jesus never appointed the civill sword for a remedy in such a case. For he did expressly appoint it in the Old Testament: nor did he ever abrogate it in the New. The reason of the Law, (which is the life of the Law) is of eternall force and equity in all Ages. *Thou shalt surely kill him, because he hath sought to thrust thee away from the Lord thy God, Deut. 13. 9, 10.* This reason is of morall, that is, of universall and perpetuall equity to put to death any Apostate seducing Idolater, or Heretick, who seeketh to thrust away the soules of Gods people, from the Lord their God. If Magistrates be the Ministers of God in the New Testament, (as Paul calleth them, Rom. 13. 4.) And Ministers of God to execute vengeance on him that doeth evill, surely either this is no evill, (to seeke to thrust away Gods people from him) or the Magistrate beareth not the sword in vaine, to execute vengeance on such an evill doer. *Yea but such an evill, is evill onely to the inner man, not to the civill State*

Answer. But if a man imagine evill against the Lord, it is a destructive evill to a whole City, yea to a Pagan City: and God will visit such an evill with such an affliction, as shall be no lesse then utter destruction to such a City: *It shall not rise up the second time, Nahum 1. 9. 11.*

Discusser.

But the civill Magistrate hath his charge of the bodies and goods of the Subject; as the Spirituall Officers of Christs City or Kingdome, have the charge of their soules, and soule-safety.

Defender.

Reply 1. If it were true, That the Magistrate hath charge onely of the bodies and goods of the Subject: yet that might iustly incite to watchfulnesse against such pollutions of Religion as tend to Apostacy. For if the Church and People of God, fall away from God, God will visit the City and Countrey with publicke calamity, if not captivity for the Churches sake. The Idolatry and Image-worship of Christians, brought in the Turkish captivity upon the Cities and Countreys of Asia, and upon some of Europe also, as hath been shewed above.

Reply 2. It is a carnall and worldly, and indeed, an ungodly imagination,

imagination, to confine the Magistrates charge, to the bodies, and goods of the Subject, and to exclude them from the care of their soules. Did ever God commit the charge of the body to any Governours, to whom, he did not commit (in his way) the care of soules also? Hath God committed to Parents the charge of their childrens bodies, and not the care of their soules? To Masters the charge of their servants bodies, and not of their soules? to Captaines the charge of their souldiers bodies, and not of their soules? Shall the Captaines suffer false worship, yea idolatry, publicly professed and practised in the campe, and yet looke to prosper in the Battell? The Magistrates to whom God hath committed the charge of bodies, and outward man of the Subject, are they not also to take care to procure faithfull Teachers to be sent amongst them? *Jehosaphat* tooke faithfull care for the soules of his people in this kind, 2 *Chron.* 17. 7, 8, 9. Neither did he this as a Type of Christ; but as a Servant of Christ. Those things are said to be done as Types of Christ, which being ceremoniall duties, were afterwards done by Christ in his owne Person, and so were in him accomplished, and abolished: And it would be sacriledge to performe the same after him. But let the conscience of any sincere Christian iudge, whether it would be sacriledge in a godly Magistrate, to procure the sending forth of godly Preachers into all the blind corners of his countrey? The truth is, Church-Governours, and civill-governours doe herein stand paralell one to another. The Church-Governours though to them be chiefly committed the charge of soules, as their adzquate obiects: yet in order to the good of the soules of their people, to dehorte from idlenesse, negligence, from intemperancy in meates and drinckes, from oppression, and deceit, and therein provide both for the health of their bodies, and the safety of their estates. So civill-governours though to them be chiefly committed the bodies and goods of the people (as their adzquate obiects:) yet in order to this, they may and ought to procure spirituall helpe to their soules, and to prevent such spirituall evils, as that the prosperity of Religion amongst them might advance the prosperity of the civill State.

Reply 3. I cannot but with griefe observe the sinfull guile of the Discusser: who whilest he taketh off all charges of soules from the

the civill Magistrates, and layeth it upon Church-Governours, he taketh it off from Church-Governours too, that so the whole charge of precious soules (for whom Christ dyed) might utterly fall to the ground. For how shall Church-Governours take the charge of soules upon them, if there be no Church-Governours? And how shall there be Church-Governours, where there be no Churches? If Churches be all dissipated and rooted out from the face of the Earth by the Apostacy of Antichrist, and none to be gathered againe, till new Apostles or Evangelists be sent abroad for such a worke, then there be now neither Churches, nor Church-Governours, nor Church-censures, either to censure Hereticks, or to fetch in those stray soules whom they have scatter'd. And then rejoyce yee Hereticks, and all yee Idolaters, and Seducers, and goe on, and make havock of the sheep of Christ like ravenous Wolves: you may now doe it (*impune*) without feare or danger; It is neither for Civill Governours, nor Church-Governours to meddle with you; Not for Civill Governours, for they are not to judge nor punish in matters of Religion: Nor for Church-Governours, for there are neither Churches, nor Church-Governours extant now upon the face of the Earth. But woe be to you poore sheepe and Lambes of Christ Jesus: you are now indeed truly become the *sheep of the slaughter*, your Possessours may slay you, and plead themselves not guilty, (*Zach. 11. 4, 5.*) not guilty before the Civill Barre: for their crime is exempted from civill cognizance: not guilty before the Churches Tribunall: for there be no Churches to call them to account.

CHAP. 35. A Reply to his 35. Chap.

Discusser.

If it were the Magistrates duty or office, to punish Hereticks, then is he both a Temporall and Ecclesiasticall Officer.

Defender.

It followeth not: unlesse the Magistrate were to punish them with Ecclesiasticall censures, which he neither doth, nor may doe. The punishments which he inflicteth on them, are meerely Civill, whether imprisonment, banishment, or death.

Discusser.

Discusser.

That Doctrine and distinction, that a Magistrate may punish an Heretick civilly, will not here awayle. For what is Babell, if this be not confusedly to punish Corporall, or Civill offences, with spirituall, or Church-censures (the offender not being a member of it :) or to punish soule or spirituall offences, with Corporall or Temporall weapons proper to Delinquents against the Civill State.

Defender.

It is no Babell, or Babilonish confusion to punish corporall, or civill offences, with Spirituall or Church-censures. What if a Brother be a striker, an oppressour, a murderer, a fornicator, or Adulterer? all these are corporall, and civill offences. But shall not therefore the Church punish these with spirituall, and Church-censures? Then the Apostle was mistaken, who directeth so to doe, 1 Cor 5. 11. why the Discusser putteth in that parenthesis (the offender not being a member of it :) I cannot tell: sure I am, it is nothing to the purpose. For as the Church cannot punish any offender, unlesse he be a member of the Church, so neither may the Civill Magistrate punish an Heretick or other spirituall offender, unlesse he be a member of his Common-wealth.

And if it be no confusion to punish civill offences with Church-censures, it is no confusion to punish spirituall offences with civill censures. And the reason of both these is the same, there be sundry civill offences, which are also transgressions of the Rule of the word, and so offences to the Consciences of the Church, and so justly subject to Church-censure. There be also offences to the Order and peace of the Church, which tend likewise to provoke wrath against a Civill State. As the King of Persia said, *Whatsoever is commanded by the God of Heaven for the House of God, let it be diligently done: for why should there be wrath against the King and his Sonnes?* Ezra 7. 3. If offences to the Church doe provoke wrath against the Civill State, it is no confusion in the Civill State to punish such.

Discusser.

What were it with the Civill Magistrate, if together with the common care and charge of the Common-wealth, the blood of every soule that perissheth, should cry against him, unlesse he should say with Paul, Act 20. I am cleare from the blood of all men, &c.

Defender.

Defender.

It is not the blood of every soule that perisheth, that can cry against a Magistrate, unless the soule perish by some such neglect of duty in the Magistrate, which God requireth of him for the good of the soules of his people. Of which Duties there be two sorts.

1. To seeke out and procure meanes of Grace for them so farre as they are capable in Gods way.

2. To remove meanes of their corruption and pollution, such as Idolls openly erected, and Idolatrous false Teachers perverting the people. If in both these, the Magistrate be faithfull, though thousands of soules may perish under his Government, yet he is innocent from the blood of them all, and may so professe with Paul.

Discusser.

I acknowledge the Magistrate ought to cherish (as a Foster Father) the Lord Jesus in his Truth, in his Saints, to cleave unto them himselfe, to countenance them unto the Death, yea also to breake the Teeth of the Lyons, who offer civill violence and injurie unto them. But to see all his Subjects, Christians, to keep such a Church, or Christians in the purity of worship, and see them doe their duty, this belongeth to the head of the body the Lord Jesus, and such spirituall Officers, as be hath to this purpose deputed.

Reply. 1. What is said of Spirituall Officers deputed by Christ to see the Church to doe her Duty, is but a pretence, when he acknowledgeth no Church, nor spirituall Officers in the Church deputed by Christ, extant upon the face of the Earth.

Reply. 2. What Reason can the Discusser give why the Magistrate should breake the teeth of the Lyons, who offer civill violence to the Church and Saints, and not breake the teeth of the ravenous wolves (false Prophets) who offer violence to their soules? Doubtlesse those ravenous wolves, that make havock of their soules, are farre more mischievous then the Lyons be, that offer violence to their bodier. The Romane pagan Emperours (who like Lions persecuted the Church, 2 Tim. 4. 17.) they by persecution increased it, though against their wills. But the Romane Popish Bishops, that like ravenous wolves devoured their soules, left the Church of Christ scarce visible, (though visible) and them, a very small remnant, though a remnant. It may be matter

matter of just wonderment, why Antichrist should find more favours in the *Discussers* eyes, then an ignorant Pagan, when the one hateth Christ more bitterly, and maketh farre more waste of the Church, and Saints of Christ, then doth the other. Is it because his owne Spirit doth more symbolize with Antichrist then with *Cesar*? Rather in secret supplanting, then in open persecuting the Churches and Ordinances of Christ?

Reply. 3. We doe not say that it is a part of the Magistrates duty, to see all his Subjects to become Christians, if they were Pagans before: though wee say, it is his Duty to neglect no good meanes to help them onward to the knowledge and faith of Christ Jesus. But why doth the *Discussor* shake this duty out of the Magistrates, to see that the Church, and the Christians under his Government, should walke in purity of worship, at least not so farre to degenerate and apostate as to provoke Christ to depart from them? Can he hope that such Christians will be faithfull and loyall to their Prince, whom he seeth to grow false and disloyall to their God? Surely the Land of *Ismael* though it had some peculiar and and typicall Holinesse belonging to it, yet no other then what did prefigure the Holinesse of the Church, which is as holy to Christ, and ought to be as holy to us, as the Land of *Israel* was to them. If therefore it was the duty of *Jehosaphat*, *Hezekiah*, and *Isaiah*, to reduce the people of *Israel* from their backslidings, because they were an holy people, (2 *Chron.* 19. 4.) Surely the like Duty lyeth upon all Godly Christian Princes, to reduce their backsliding Churches to their Primitive Purity.

Let no man say, that as the Holy Land of *Israel*, was a Type of Holy Church: So these Princes were Types of the Lord Jesus, to whom alone it belongeth to see Churches and Christians to doe their duty in Purity of worship.

For though *David* and *Salmon* were Types of Christ, (and so the Scripture holdeth them forth:) yet the Scripture giveth no hint, that the other Kings either of *Israel*, or *Judah* were Types. Not of *Israel*, for they were all Apostates: nor of *Judah*, for if the Kings of *Judah* (as Kings of *Judah*, to wit, in respect of their Regall Estate over the Church) if they were all of them Types of Christ, then Apostates from Christ, were Types of Christ. For many of the Kings of *Judah* were Apostates from Christ as well as the Kings of *Israel*.

Yea,

Yea, if they were all Types of Christ, then Christ is the Antitype, and by accomplishing such types, hath abolished them all: so that now it were sacrilegious and Antichristian usurpation for any Kings to be set over Christians, or the people of God. For the Body being come, Types and shadowes vanish.

But what if they were all types of Christ in respect of their Kingly office over the Church alone? were they therefore types of Christ in all the Kingly Offices which they performed? Then it was typical in *Solomon* to put *Joab* a Murderer to death, and *Adonijah* a Traytor. And then it will be unlawfull for Christian Princes to put Murderers or Traitors to death.

Or if you say these were civill crimes: But Idolatry and Heresie, which *Asa*, *Joash*, and *Josiah* punished with death, were spirituall crimes, and therefore the Kings of *Judah* in punishing these latter, were types of Christ, not so in the former: this is spoken gratis. For whatsoever the Kings of *Judah* did, as types of Christ, Christ being the Antitype, might more full, and lively performe it in his owne person. But certaine it is, he put no man to death in his owne person, all the dayes of his flesh. Why therefore may it not rather be said, that whatsoever the Kings of *Judah* lawfully did, whether against the Transgressours of the first or second Table, they did it not as types of Christ, but as servants of Christ, be- trusted with the care of the welfare both of Church and Common-wealth, and therefore as patternes and examples to Christi- an Magistrates?

And indeed many of the Kings of *Israel*, as they were Kings over a Common-wealth, which was also a Church, so they were Kings also over sundry Pagan Nations round about them, as were *David* and *Solomon*, *Asa* and *Jehosaphat*, *Joash* and *Josiah*. And though none of them compelled the Pagan Nations, to become Profelites to the Church of *Israel* (no more then Christian Kings may compell Pagans to become Christians, or men without to become Church-members) yet *Ahab*, though King over an Apo- state Church, having gotten Pagan *Benhadad* by conquest under his Dominion, because he put him not to death for his blasphe- my, forfeited his owne life for his, 1 Kings 20. 23. with 42.

C H A P. 36

A Reply to his Chapter 36. Discussing the Text in Luke 9. 54, 55.

Discussor.

THe next Scripture brought by the Letter against such Persecution, is Luke, 9. 54, 55. where the Lord Jesus reproved his Disciples, who would have fire come downe from Heaven, to have devoured those Samaritans, that would not receive him, in these words, You know not of what spirit you are, the Sonne of man is not come to destroy mens lives but to save them.

With this Scripture Mr. Cotton joyneth the next, and answereth both in one, which is this, 2 Tim. 2. 24. The servant of the Lord must not strive, but must be gentle towards all men, proving if at any time, God will give them Repentance, &c. unto both these Scriptures, he giveth this Answer.

Both these are directions to Ministers of the Gospel, how to deale, (not with obstinate offenders in the Church, but) either with men without, as the Samaritans were, and many unconverted Christians in Creete, whom Titus (as an Evangelist) was to seeke to convert.

Or at best, with some Jewes or Gentiles in the Church, who though carnall, yet were not convinced of the Errours of their way. And it is true, it became not the Spirit of the Gospel, to convert Aliens to the Faith, (Such as the Samaritans were) by Fire and Brimstone, nor to deale harshly in publick Ministry, or private conference, with all such severall-minded men, as either had not yet entred into Church-fellowship, or if they had, did hitbert to sinne of Ignorance, not against Conscience. But neither of both these Texts, doe binder a Minister of the Gospel to proceed in a Church-way against Church-members, when they become scandalous, either in life, or Doctrine: much lesse doe they speake at all to the Civill Magistrate.

Defender.

The matter of this Answer, it is likely enough was given by me: for it suiteth with mine owne apprehensions, both then and now. But some expressions in laying it downe, I doe not owne, nor can I finde any Copie under my owne hand-writing, that
might

might testifie, how I did expresse my selfe, especially in a word or two, wherein the *Discusser* observeth (in chap. 38.) some halte, and light, and sleepy attention. But if the *Discusser* can shew the same under mine owne hand, (as it is not impossible) I shall be willing (by Gods help) both to acknowledge it, and my haste in it.

CHAP. 37. *A Reply to his Chap. 37.*

Discusser.

THis perplexed and ravelled Answer, wherein so many things, and so doubtfull are wrapped up and entangled together, I shall take in pieces.

1. That the Lord Jesus in rebuking his Disciples rash and bloudy zeale against the Samaritans, did not hereby binder the Ministers of the Gospel, to proceed in a Church-way against scandalous offenders, is not here questioned.

Defender.

Well then, this Point is none of those many doubtfull things here wrapped: much lesse is it perplexed, or ravelled, but a plaine, and confessed Truth. But whether the Author of that Letter sent to me, did take it for a certaine and unquestioned Truth, I did not know: nor doe I yet know, unlesse the *Discusser* speake his mind herein, as well as his owne. Sure I am, Prosecution in a Church-way, (if the cause be not just) is as odious and dreadfull a Persecution, as Prosecution in a Court of civill Justice, as hath been proved above.

Discusser.

Secondly, when the Answerer saith, much lesse doth this Text speake at all to the civill Magistrate: here I observe, that he implyeth, that beside the censure of the Lord Jesus in the hands of his spirituall Governors, for any spirituall evill, in Life or Doctrine, the civill Magistrate is also to inflict corporall punishment.

Defender.

This observation I may truly say is ravelled out of my Answer, and that so perplexedly, that it cannot be wound up out of my Answer without breaking the threed, both of my words, and meaning. It is a plaine and certaine Truth, that as the Disciples were not civill Magistrates, so neither doth Christ speake to them in

this Reproofe as to such. But it is farre from me to say, that it is lawfull for civill Magistrates to inflict corporall punishment upon men contrary minded, standing in the same state the Samaritans did. No such thought arose in my heart, nor fell from my pen, either in my Answer to the Letter, or in any writing of mine, that it is lawfull for a Civill Magistrate (though he had dominion over Pagans, much lesse if he have none) to inflict corporall punishments upon such as are contrary minded in matters of Religion. No, these are ravellings of a loose and ungirt disputer, not the Inferences of a serious and solid *Discusser*. And therefore the Reasons which he bringeth in the Sequele of this chapter, that the Magistrates should not lay violent hands upon any (such as the Samaritanes) for not receiving of the Lord Jesus, might well have been spared: for they fight not against me, but against a shadow of his owne fancy.

But when he maketh the Fire that fell downe from Heaven, *Rev. 13. 13.* to be the fiery Judgements and persecutions, which the second Beast perswaded the civill Powers, to destroy the Saints withall, as if they were Gods just Judgements from Heaven upon Hereticks.

This is such an Interpretation, as ravelleth the Text, and will not stand with the Context. For the Text speaketh of it, as a great wonder, that the Beast should make Fire to come downe from Heaven upon Earth in the sight of men, *ver. 13.* But this was no wonder to cause civill Powers to inflict fiery Judgements of Imprisonment, Banishment, Death upon Hereticks; for Constantine had done as much before.

And the *Arrian* Bishops had caused *Constantine* to doe as much against the Orthodox Saints. Besides in the Context, *ver. 15.* It is expressely there declared as a distinct matter from the former, that he had Power to cause that as many as would not worship the Image of the Beast, should be killed. This is a different effect (and recorded as different) from the former of causing fire to come downe from Heaven, and that, not upon the Saints, but upon Earth.

CHAP. 38.

A Reply to his Chap. 38. Discussing the place in Timothy. 2 Tim. 2. 25, 26.

Discusser.

I Acknowledge, this Instruction, to be meeke and patient to all men, &c. is properly an Instruction to the Ministers of the Gospel.

Defender.

Then hitherto the Answer is not perplexed and ravelled.

Discusser.

Yet divers Arguments will from hence be truly and fairely collected, to manifest and evince, how farre the civill Magistrate ought to be, from dealing with the civill Sword in spirituall cases.

But first by the way, I desire to aske, what the Answerer meaneth by his unconverted Christian in Creete? An unconverted Christian, is as much as an unconverted Convert, untamed tamed, unholy holy, Christians and Antichristians.

How sad an evidence is this, that the soule of the Answerer, hath never yet heard the call of the Lord Jesus to come out from those unconverted Churches, from that unconverted Antichristian-Christian world? &c.

Defender.

Reply. 1. When we come to those Arguments truly, and fairly collected out of this place of Timothy (which is not till the next chapter) we shall, (God willing) consider what Truth and fairness they hold forth: which if it be found, wee shall consider, whether they be of force against the Truth witnessed by me.

In the meane time, for Answer to his demand, what I should mean, by the unconverted Christian in Creete?

Answer. I must take it upon his credit, that I spake at all of any unconverted Christian in Creete. Mine owne copy is not extant with me. And the Transcript, which with much seeking, I found, hath it, instead of unconverted Christians in Creete, unconverted persons in Ephesus. As indeed Timothy was left at Ephesus when Paul wrote to him his first Epistle, as is evident, 1 Tim. 1. 3. and Titus it was, who was left at Creete, Tit. 1. 5. But whether Timo-

thy

why was then at *Ephesus*, when *Paul* wrote his second Epistle to him, is not so certaine. But wheresoever he was (as being an Evangelist, he was not limited to a certaine place) doubtlesse there wanted not unconverted persons, amongst whom the Members of the Church lived.

Yea, but they were not unconverted Christians, for it is as much, as unconverted Converts, &c.

Ans. It must lye upon the Discussers credit, whether I used at all such a phrase or no: sure I am, I cannot hitherto (after much seeking) find mine owne hand-written copy, which might cleare the mistake, both of Creet for *Ephesus*, and unconverted Christians for unconverted Persons.

But let it not seeme strange to him, to heare tell of unconverted Christians, or unconverted Converts. There is no contradiction at all in the words. When the Lord saith, that *Judab* turned unto him, not with all her heart, but fainedly, (Jer. 3. 10.) Was she not then an unconverted Convert? converted in shew and profession, but unconverted in heart and Truth? Let him then consider his owne phrase here misapplyed, whether this be the Language of *Canaan*, or the Language of *Ashdod*. *Jeremies* Language is the Language of *Anatboth*, not of *Ashdod*.

Reply. 2. If the Discusser looke at it as a true, but sad experience of my unconverted estate, from unconverted Churches, and that the Lord *Jesus* never yet called me to come out of them, because I speake (if I doe so speake) of unconverted Christians living amongst them.

I must be contented still to lie under that imputation from him. I never knew that Church yet, nor ever read of it, in which there was not, (or at least might not) be found, some unconverted Christians, unconverted Converts. *Judas* was found in Christs Family: *Ananias* and *Sapphira*, in the Apostolick Primitive Church: *Balaam* and the *Nicholaitans* were found in *Pergamus*, and *Jesabel* in *Thyatira*.

Besides I have not yet learned, (nor doe I thinke, I ever shall) that the children of beleiving Parents borne in the Church, are all of them Pagans, and no Members of the Church: or that being Members of the Church, (& so holy) that they are all of them truly converted. And if they be not alwayes truly converted, then let him not wonder, nor stumble at the phrase of unconverted Christians.

But

But if the *Discussor* doe sadly observe it, that my soule hath not yet heard the call of the Lord Jesus to come out of unconverted Churches: truly I have just cause (not without sadnesse and mourning) to consider, and to pray, that he might consider, what call of the Lord Jesus his soule hath heard to come out, not onely out of unconverted Churches, but converted too, yea out of all Churches?

Discussor.

Againe, I observe the haste and light attention of the Answerer, to these Scriptures (as commonly the Spirits of Gods children in matters of Gods Kingdome, are very sleepy:) for these persons here spoken of were not unconverted Christians in Creete, whom Titus as an Evangelist was to convert, but they were such Opposites, as Timothy (to whom Paul writeth this Letter at Ephesus) should not meet withall.

Defender.

Whether such words be found in the copy of my Answer to the Letter, I leave it to the *Discussors* credit. As I said even now, mine owne copy I cannot (after much diligent search) finde: the Transcript which I have found hath it otherwise, the unconverted Persons in *Ephesus*, whom *Timothy* as an Evangelist was to seeke, to convert. But if my copy doe speake as he reporteth:

Then, 1. I doe not deny, but have just cause to acknowledge mine owne haste, and light attention, and sleepinesse in the matters of Christs Kingdome, not onely in this passage: but frequently else in the race of my Christian course of life. The Disciples themselves Christ found sleepy, *Matth. 26. 40.* how much more may he find me sleepy?

2. The *Discussor* might have imputed it as well, to my hast to gratifie his earnest desire to Answer his friends Letter, and to my confidence in his love, that for hast to satisfie him, mistooke one place and person for another, and was not so attentive to peruse and examine the copy sent by me to him, as I would have been, had I sent it to an Adversary.

3. The case is all one in the matters of Christs Kingdome, whether I had named *Timothy*, or *Titus*, *Ephesus*, or *Creete*: For the persons were both of them Evangelists, and the places of them both such, as had unconverted persons in them, and (like enough) unconverted Christians too: *Ephesus* had evill persons amongst them,

them, whom they could not beare, (*Rev. 2. 2.*) as well as *Crees* had amongst them such as were *alwayes lyars, evill Beasts, slow bellies*, *Tit. 1. 12.*

4. The *Discusser*, that observeth haste, and light attention, and sleepinesse in another, one would thinke, would be more vigilant, and attentive himselfe. He that saith (as the *Discusser* doth in his parenthesis) that *Paul* wrote this Letter, (to wit, his second Epistle) to *Timothy* at *Ephesus*, taketh it for granted, that which without some hasty lightnesse, even the same, which he blameth in my selfe, he cannot beleive, that *Paul* wrote his second to *Timothy* at *Ephesus*. There is no word in the Epistle, that speaketh of *Timothies* being at *Ephesus*, when *Paul* wrote that second Epistle. His calling of an Evangelist did not permit him to tarry long in a place: and the first Epistle to *Timothy*, is thought by the Learned to have been written one of the first of all *Pauls* Epistles, next after those of the *Thessalonians*. But the second Epistle to *Timothy* was written last of all the Epistles, when *Pauls* time of departure was at hand, 2 *Tim. 4. 6.* And when *Paul* writeth 2 *Timothy 4. 12.* that he had sent *Tychicus* to *Ephesus*, It is not likely, he would have written so to *Timothy*, if *Timothy* then had been at *Ephesus*. For *Timothy* would have knowne, that *Tychicus* had been at *Ephesus*: or if *Tychicus* had been then but on his way to *Ephesus* (which is a narrow point of time) it is more then propable, if *Timothy* had been then at *Ephesus*, he would have said, *Tychicus have I sent to thee to Ephesus.*

CHAP. 39. A Reply to his 39. Chap.

Discusser.

BUt from this place in *Timothy* (2 *Tim. 2. 25.*) in particular, I argue thus

1. If the Civill Magistrates be Christians or Members of the Church, able to prophesie to the Church of Christ; then they are bound by this command of Christ, to suffer opposition to their Doctrine, with meeknesse and gentlenesse, waiting if God peradventure will give them Repentance.

So also it pleaseth the Answerer to acknowledge in these words: It becometh

cometh not the spirit of the Gospel to convert Aliens to the Faith (such as the Samaritans and unconverted persons, whether in Ephesus, or Creete) with Fire and Sword.

Defender.

The Answerer is still of the same mind, though he might strike in upon the advantage, that if the Magistrate be also a Prophet, he may doe some things as a Magistrate, which he may not doe as a Prophet: yet he willingly acknowledgeth, that if a Magistrate be also a Prophet (yea, whether he be a Prophet, or no) he ought not to seeke to subdue, and convert Aliens to the Faith, by Fire and Sword.

Discusser.

Secondly, if the Oppositions be within, and the Church-members become scandalous in Doctrine (I speake not of scandalls in the Civill State, which the civill Magistrate ought to punish.) It is the Lord onely (as the Scripture in Timothy implieth) who is able to give them Repentance, and to recover them out of Satans snare, &c. It is true, the civill Sword may make a whole Nation of Hypocrites, as the Lord complaineth, Isay 10. and as befell our Native Country in a few scores of yeares, in the severall Reignes of Henry 7. Henry 8. King Edward, Queen Mary, Queens Elizabeth; under whom our Nation was as ready to change the fashions of their Religions, as of their Suits of Apparell, which hath been their sinfull shame.

Defender.

If Opposition rise from within, from the Members of the Church, I doe not beleive it to be lawfull for the Magistrate to seeke to subdue, and convert them to be of his mind by the civill Sword: But rather to use all spirituall meanes for their conviction, and conversion. But if the Opposition still continue in Doctrine and Worship, and that against the vitals, and Fundamentalls of Religion (whether by Heresie of Doctrine, or Idolatry in Worship) and shall proceed to seeke the Seduction of others, I doe beleive the Magistrate is not to tolerate such opposition against the Truth in Church-members, or in any Professours of the Truth after due conviction from the word of Truth. Nor is it an Objection of any weight, that neither the Magistrate, nor his Sword can give Repentance unto such.

For neither can he give Repentance unto such persons as are

M

scandalous

scandalous to the civill State, whom yet notwithstanding the *Discusser* himselfe acknowledgeth the civill Magistrate ought to punish. Though the civill Sword should not make the opposers Hypocrites, yet better tolerate Hypocrites and Tares, then Bryars and Thornes. In such cases the civill Sword doth not so much attend the conversion of wicked Seducers, as the prevention of the seduction of honest minds by their meanes.

What the Kings and Queens of *England* have done in former, or later times, either by violent Persecution of the Truth, or in preposterous maintenance of the Truth, we have cause rather to bewaile it: (and so hath the *Discusser* too, if he be an *English* man) then to justifie it: as also bewaile the like vanity justly complained of in sundry of our *English* Nation, to be as ready to change the fashions of their Religion, as of their Rayment. And yet he cannot be ignorant, that the Lord hath chosen to himselfe sundry faithfull witnesses out of that Nation, who have continued stedfast unto the death in the Profession of the Truth, and have not been carried away, either with the feare of civill Sword, or with the deceitfull insinuations of unstable but seducing Teachers, to depart from the simplicity and Truth of the Gospel. But howsoever worfull, and wonderfull changes have been made of Religion in *England*, in the Reigne of foure or five Princes, yet it is no more then befell the Church of *Judah*, in the dayes of *Ahas* and *Hezekiah*, *Manasseh*, and *Josiah*; yet the Prophets never upbraided them with the civill Magistrates Power in causes of Religion, as the cause of it. Better some vicissitudes in Religion, then a constant continuance in Idolatry, and Popery, by Princes referring all causes of Religion to Church-men. The Prophecies of *Englands* Revolt againe to Popery, wanteth Scripture Light.

CHAP. 40. A Reply to his Chap. 40.

Discusser.

BUT it hath been thought and said, shall Oppositions against the Truth escape unpunished? will they not prove mischievous? I answer as before, concerning the blind Guides, their case being incurable is rather to be lamented, since none but the right hand of the Lord, in the

the meeke and gentle Dispensing of the word of Truth; can release them,

Defender,

So it is with all scandalous offenders against the civil State: none can give them healing Repentance, but the right hand of the Lord Jesus, in the dispensing of the word of Truth: yet that doth not reſtraine Magiſtrates from executing juſt Judgement upon them. So neither doth it reſtraine them from executing the like juſt Judgement againſt theſe, though not to procure the Repentance of incurable obſtinate Hereticks, and Idolaters: yet to prevent the ſeduction and ſubverſion of others. What though a dead ſoule, though changed from one Worſhip to another, (*like a dead man ſhifted into ſeverall ſuites of Apparell*) cannot pleaſe God? Heb. 11. 6. *And what though Faith be that gift, which proceedeth alone from that Father of Lights?* Phil. 1. 29.

Yet better a dead ſoule be dead in body, as well as in Spirit, then to live, and be lively in the fleſh, to murder many precious ſoules by the Magiſtrates Indulgence. And better he die without Faith, then to live to ſeduce many honeſt minds to depart from the Faith.

Diſcuſſer.

I adde, a civill Sword hardneth the followers of falſe Teachers, by the ſufferings of their falſe and Antichriſtian Seducers.

And ſecondly, it begetteth in them an Impreſſion of the falſhood of that Religion, which cannot uphold it ſelfe, but with ſuch Inſtruments of violence, and wanteth the ſoft, and gentle commiſeration of the blindneſſe of others.

Defender.

A civill Magiſtrate ought not to draw out his civill Sword againſt any Seducers (Whether Hereticks, or Idolaters) till he have uſed all good meanes for their conviction, and thereby clearly manifeſted the bowels of tender commiſeration and compaſſion towards them.

But if after their continuance in obſtinate Rebellion againſt the Light, he ſhall ſtill walke towards them in ſoft and gentle commiſeration, his ſoftneſſe and gentleneſſe is exceſſive large to Foxes, and wolves: But his bowels are miſerably ſtraitned and hardned againſt the poore ſheepe and Lambs of Chriſt. If any be hardned

scandalous to the civill State, whom yet notwithstanding the *Discusser* himselfe acknowledgeth the civill Magistrate ought to punish. Though the civill Sword should not make the opposers Hypocrites, yet better tolerate Hypocrites and Tares, then Bryars and Thornes. In such cases the civill Sword doth not so much attend the conversion of wicked Seducers, as the prevention of the seduction of honest minds by their meanes.

What the Kings and Queens of *England* have done in former, or later times, either by violent Persecution of the Truth, or in preposterous maintenance of the Truth, we have cause rather to bewaile it: (and so hath the *Discusser* too, if he be an *English* man) then to justifie it: as also bewaile the like vanity justly complained of in sundry of our *English* Nation, to be as ready to change the fashions of their Religion, as of their Rayment. And yet he cannot be ignorant, that the Lord hath chosen to himselfe sundry faithfull witnesses out of that Nation, who have continued stedfast unto the death in the Profession of the Truth, and have not been carried away, either with the feare of civill Sword, or with the deceitfull insinuations of unstable but seducing Teachers, to depart from the simplicity and Truth of the Gospel. But howsoever wooll, and wonderfull changes have been made of Religion in *England*, in the Reigne of foure or five Princes, yet it is no more then befell the Church of *Judah*, in the dayes of *Ahas* and *Hezekiah*, *Manasseh*, and *Josiah*; yet the Prophets never upbraided them with the civill Magistrates Power in causes of Religion, as the cause of it. Better some vicissitudes in Religion, then a constant continuance in Idolatry, and Popery, by Princes referring all causes of Religion to Church-men. The Prophecie of *Englands* Revolt againe to Popery, wanteth Scripture Light.

CHAP. 40. A Reply to his Chap. 40.

Discusser.

BUT it hath been thought and said, shall Oppositions against the Truth escape unpunished? will they not prove mischievous? I answer as before, concerning the blind Guides, their case being incurable is rather to be lamented, since none but the right hand of the Lord, in
the

the meeke and gentle Dispensing of the word of Truth; can release them,

Defender,

So it is with all scandalous offenders against the civil State: none can give them healing Repentance, but the right hand of the Lord Jesus, in the dispensing of the word of Truth: yet that doth not reſtraine Magiſtrates from executing juſt Judgement upon them. So neither doth it reſtraine them from executing the like juſt Judgement againſt theſe, though not to procure the Repentance of incurable obſtinate Hereticks, and Idolaters: yet to prevent the ſeduction and ſubverſion of others. What though a dead ſoule, though changed from one Worſhip to another, (like a dead man ſhifted into ſeverall ſuites of Apparell) cannot pleaſe God? Heb. 11. 6. And what though Faith be that gift, which proceedeth alone from that Father of Lights? Phil. 1. 29.

Yet better a dead ſoule be dead in body, as well as in Spirit, then to live, and be lively in the fleſh, to murder many precious ſoules by the Magiſtrates Indulgence. And better he die without Faith, then to live to ſeduce many honeſt minds to depart from the Faith.

Diſcuſſer.

I adde, a civill Sword hardneth the followers of falſe Teachers, by the ſufferings of their falſe and Antichriſtian Seducers.

And ſecondly, it begetteth in them an Impreſſion of the falſhood of that Religion, which cannot uphold it ſelfe, but with ſuch Inſtruments of violence, and wanteth the ſoft, and gentle commiſeration of the blindneſſe of others.

Defender.

A civill Magiſtrate ought not to draw out his civill Sword againſt any Seducers (Whether Hereticks, or Idolaters) till he have uſed all good meanes for their conviction, and thereby clearly manifeſted the bowels of tender commiſeration and compaſſion towards them.

But if after their continuance in obſtinate Rebellion againſt the Light, he ſhall ſtill walke towards them in ſoft and gentle commiſeration, his ſoftneſſe and gentleneſſe is exceſſive large to Foxes, and wolves: But his bowels are miſerably ſtraitned and hardned againſt the poore ſheepe and Lambs of Chriſt. If any be hardned

by the just and faithfull severity of Magistrates in this case, it is meerely accidentall, from the extreme perversnesse of the deceitfull and corrupt heart of man, not from any corruption found in such dealings of Magistrates. Yea, Experience speaketh the contrary, not onely in the instance of the *Donatists*, who were many of them reclaimed, by the just severity of the civill Magistrate in *Augustines* time: But also in our owne memory. Let the *Discusser* speake his conscience, whether Popery or Papists did more swarme and abound in *Queen Elizabeths* dayes, then in the dayes of *King James*?

Discusser.

Antonius Pius, the Emperour of Rome, upon this occasion, wrote to all the Governours of his Provinces, to forbear the Persecution of Christians, because such dealing was so farre from converting Christians from their way, that it rather begat in their mindes an opinion of their Cruelty.

Defender.

No marvell: for first the Pagan Religion was not of God, but palpable and grosse Idolatry: But the Religion of Christians came downe from Heaven, in the Gospel of Truth. It is cruelty in a Magistrate, and it will beget in the minds of indifferent men, an opinion of his cruelty, to murder Innocents (and that *indifferent* : when it will never be found guilty, nor beget in equall minds an opinion of the cruelty of such, as shall put to Death Murderers, and obstinate destroyers of the life of Soules.

Secondly, It is evident, the persecuting Emperours, and their Governours of Provinces under them, attended not at all, to the conviction of Christians, nor did they indeavour to make it appeare, that the Christians sinned against the Light of their owne consciences: And therefore we marvell, if it bred in the people, a just opinion of the cruelty of Persecutors, and of the Innocency of Christians.

3. It is an untrue Intimation of the *Discusser*, that *Antonius* forbade the persecution of Christians upon any such grounds, as if he affected rather their conversion (which harsh dealing might alienate them from: or as if by reason of hard dealing with them, it bred in the Christians an opinion of the cruelty of their Persecutors: which he was desirous to avoyd. Read both the Rescript

cripts of *Antoninus Pius*, both to the men of *Asia*, and to the Senate of *Rome*: and he giveth other just Reasons of forbidding the persecution of them: as in respect of their confidence on God in times of danger, above Pagans: and in respect of his Fathers favourable grant to them: and chiefly in that by their Prayers they had saved his Army in great distresse in *Germany*, and destroyed their Enemies. But he was so farre from seeking their conversion to his Paganisme by lenity towards them, that he straitly chargeth his Officers, *μη μελίσσιν τοις τοις τοις μετάνοιαν, καὶ ἐνυπνίσαν*, not to draw any such to Repentance, and bondage. Both his Rescripts are extant in the end of *Justin Martyrs* second Apologie for Christians.

CHAP. 41.

A Reply to his Chap. 41. Discussing the Texts,
Isa. 2. 4. with Mica. 4. 3.

Discusser.

THE next Scripture against Persecution, is that of the Prophet *Isaiah* 2. 4. together with *Micah* 4. 3. They shall breake their Swords into Plowshares, and their Speares into pruning hookes: And *Isa.* 11. 9. There shall none hurt or destroy, in all the Mountaine of my Holinesse.

Unto which *Mr. Cotton* answereth, 1. That these Predictions do onely shew with what weapons Christ will subdue the Nations to the Faith of the Gospel.

2. They shew also what the meeke and peaceable temper will be of all true Converts to Christianity: not Lions, nor Leopards, nor cruell Oppressours, nor Malignant opposers, and biters one of another: but doth not forbid them to drive ravenous wolves from the sheepfold, nor to restraine them from devouring the sheep of Christ.

This first Answer is truly Christian: but me thinks the Answerer might beare a voyce from Heaven, out of thine owne mouth will I judge thee: for that which he addeth is as evill and bitter, as the former words were good and sweet; But this doth not forbid them to drive ravenous wolves from the sheepfold, and to restraine them from devouring the sheep of Christ.

But

But this fighteth against the former Truth; to wit, that Christ by spirituall weapons will subdue the Nations of the Earth to the obedience of the Gospel. For by driving away these Wolves, he intendeth not only the Resistance or violence, which the Shepherds of Christ ought spiritually to make: but the civill Resistance of the materiall Swords, staves, Guns, &c. whence I argue, that same power forceth the evil (the Wolves) out, forceth the good (the sheep) in: for of the same things, is the like and same Reason, &c.

Defender.

He should say, for of contrary things, is a contrary Reason: for sheep and wolves are not the same things: nor are force in, and force out the same things. But howsoever, his Argument is of the like force, as if he should reason, a man may with a staffe or a Sword drive away dogs, that might by the way bite, or worrey his children in going to Schoole: therefore a man may with a staffe, or a Sword drive his children to goe to schoole: for there is the same Reason of both. But doth he speak in good earnest, that there is the same Reason of both? Are Wolves to be driven away, and sheep brought into the fold by the same Instruments? Yes, saith he, the same arme that with a staffe beateth off the Wolfe, with a rod and booke bringeth in the sheep: the same Dogg that assaulteth and teareth a Wolfe, frighteth and forceth in the stragling sheep. But the Dog that is taught to assault and teare the Wolfe, if he assault and teare the sheep also, will finde a halter for his labour. And though the same Arme may with a staffe beate a Wolfe, yet it will not with the same staffe beat a sheep. The same Shepherds staffe, that knocketh downe a Wolfe on the head, hooketh in the sheep gently by the legg. The same voyce from Heaven, that calleth the sheep by Name into the sheep-fold, and leadeth them by still waters, the same voyce hath said, that Antichristian Wolves and Seducers shall drink of bloud, for they are worthy, Revel. 16. 6.

CHAP. 42. A Reply to his Chap. 42.

Defender.

IN this Chapter the Discusser maketh himselfe worke to discourse upon the Wolves, which Paul foretold to the Elders of Ephesus)

Ephesus) should come in amongst them, not sparing the flock, *Acts 20. 29.* A place which I quoted not, nor did apply to the cause in hand. (But he as a full vessell) abounding and running over in wit, and words, (and it seemeth in leasure) he propoundeth, and discusseth three Questions about these Wolves in this Chapter: and two more in the next.

Discussor.

As 1. What Wolves were those Paul warneth of? not literally meant: nor Persecutors of the Flock, such as the Romane Emperours: But such as brought in other Religions and Worships, such as amongst themselves should speake perverse things, as many Antichrists did. And I aske whether or no such as may hold forth other Worships, or Religions, (Jewes, Turkes, Antichristians) may not be peaceable and quiet Subjects, loving and helpfull neighbours, faire and just dealers? &c. It is cleare, they may, in all experiences, and yet in spirituall and Mystical Account, they are ravenous, and greedy Wolves.

Defender.

It hath been declared above, that we doe not hold it lawfull, to constraine by Civill Sword, Jewes, or Turkes, or Antichristians to be of our Religion, whether they be good Subjects, loving Neighbours, faire dealers, yea or no. Nor doth the Apostle in that Text, (which the *Discussor* hath in hand) speake of men out of the Church, Jewes, Turkes, or Antichristians, but of such as enter into the Church, and are of themselves.

Now if Church-members should Apostate from Christ, and of Christians become Jewes, and Turkes, and Antichristians, and draw away Disciples after them, I would demand of any man (whose Conscience is not past feeling of the danger of damnable Heresies) whether such Members may goe for peaceable and quiet Subjects, for loving and helpfull Neighbours, for faire and just dealers, for true and Loyall to the civill Government? If those be peaceable, and quiet Subjects, that withdraw Subjects from Subjection to Christ: if they be loving and helpfull Neighbours, that help men on to perdition: If they be faire and just dealers, that wound the soules of the best, and kill and destroy the soules of many, if such be true and loyall to Civill Government, that subject it to the Tyranny of a forraine Prelate, then it will be no advantage to civill States, when the Kingdomes of the Earth shall become the

Kingdomes

Kingdomes of our Lord : and they may doe as good service to the civill State, who bring the wrath of God upon them by their Apostacie, as they that bring downe blessings from Heaven by the Profession and Practise of the true Religion in Purity.

Discusser.

I querie secondly, to whom Paul gave this charge, to watch against them? ver. 31.

They were not the Magistrates of the City of Ephesus, but the Elders of the Church of Ephesus.

Defender.

Who doubteth of it?

Discusser.

Many of these charges and Exhortations given by Christ to the Shepherds and Ministers of the Churches, be commonly attributed and directed (by the Answerer in this Discourse) to the Civill Magistrate.

Defender.

Cujus contrarium verum est. For looke the Answer through, and you shall find, not one of these charges or Exhortations, given to Ministers, were ever directed by the Answerer, to civill Magistrates : the fallshood of the *Discusser* in this charge upon the Answerer, is palpable and notorious. And this exhortation in this place, the Answerer doth not so much as mention at all either as directed to Magistrates, or to Elders.

Discusser.

I desire it may be inquired into, whether in all the will, or Testament of Christ, there be any such word of Christ by way of Command, Promise, or Example, countenancing the Governours of the Civill State to meddle with these wolves, if in civill things peaceable and obedient.

Defender.

This Condition if (in civill things peaceable and obedient) implyeth a contradiction to the nature and practice of wolves. How can Wolves be peaceable, and obedient, unlesse they be restrained? and how can they be restrained, and not medled with? What Peace (saide Jesus) so long as the whoredomes of Jezabel, and her witchcrafts are so many, 2 Kings 9. 22.

Yes : may not spirituall whoredomes and witch-crafts stand with Civill Peace?

No verily : the whoredomes and witch-crafts of the Jezabel of Rome,

Rome, tooke away civill peace from the earth, and brought in the *Turke* to oppresse the peace both of Christian Churches and Common-wealths, as hath been shewed above, *Revel. 9. 15. 21.* That dreadfull example of Gods vengeance upon Civill States for tolerating and practising Image-worship, is a serious and loud warning to all Christian States to beware of such seducing spirits, as beare them in hand, they shall have peace, though they tolerate Idolatrous and false worships in their Territories.

Besides for another example, and that approved, you find in the Lords Testament, *Revel. 16. 4. 5. 6. 7.* of which before. And for a word of command from Christ, to meddle with wolves, that grand charter, whereby Magistrates are established in the new Testament, may abundantly suffice, The Magistrate is the Minister of God, an avenger to execute wrath upon him that doth evill *Rom. 14. 4.*

If the wolfe be an evill doer, let him looke at the Magistrate as appointed of God to be an avenger, and executor of wrath upon him. Say not, yea, if the wolfe be an evill doer against the second Table, but not so, if against the first Table: or if an evill doer against the bodies and estates of men, not so, if against their soules.

For who gave any man commission so to limit the word of God, or the power of the Magistrate? Besides it hath been often said, that he that goeth about to subvert Religion, and to destroy soules, is an evill doer against the peace of the Civill State.

Discusser.

If God had given charge to Magistrates to punish evill doers in matters of Religion, he would have given to Magistrates in the world, ability to discern, and determine, who are sheep, and who are wolfish oppressors, whom he is bound to punish and suppress. They must be able to discern this, not with others mens eyes, but with their owne

Defender.

It hath been declared above, that Magistrates ought to be so well acquainted with matters of Religion, as to discern the Fundamentall Principles thereof, and the evill of those heresies and Blasphemies, as doe subvert the same. Their ignorance thereof, is no discharge of their duty before the Lord. Such wolfish oppressors,

oppressors, and Doctrines, and practises as they cannot discern with their own eyes, It will be their sin, either to suppress them, because they cannot doe it of faith: or to tolerate them, because they are destructive to the soules of the people, and enemies to the common salvation. Gallio is justly censured as a prophane man, not because he refused to be a Judge in matters concerning the Jewish worship, and Religion: (for he had noe Law of Caesar, whose Deputy he was, to judge of it:) but because he rejected the cognizance of such causes of Religion, as a Question of words and Names. Which made him to saue regardlesse of causes of Religion, that though the Civill peace was broken by the Jews (in pursuance of Paul) the Jews laying violent hands upon Sosthenes, and that before the judgement Seate, yet Gallio cared for none of those things, Acts 18, 15. 16, 17.

Discusser.

In the third place, I *Quere*, Whether the Father who gave the sheep, and the Sonne who keepeth them, be not greater then all? And who can plucke the Elect out of his hand? which Answereth the common objection of the danger of devouring soules.

Defender.

It doth not Answer that Objection. For the Father, and Sonne were greater then all in the old Testament, as well as in the New: And none could then pluck his Elect out of their hands, no more then now: yet the attempt to pluck them out of Gods hand was a Capitall crime then, Deut. 13, 5, 10. For speaking to turne away a soule from God. ver. 5. and seeking to thrust away a soule from God, are but attempts. Besides God putteth no difference of Elect and Reprobate in matter of murder either of soule, or Body: But the respect, which God hath in this case, is to his Covenant, which God made with the visible members of his Church.

Now. if a man shall so farre violate his Covenant as to Apostate from God, and to draw others away to Apostate from him, the Lord avengeth this quarrell of his Covenant upon the lives of such. And therefore the hainousnesse of this crime is expressed, in that he spake, or sought to turne away any of the people of God from the Lord their God, Deut. 13, 5, 10.

Chap. 49.

CHAP. 43. A Reply to his Chap. 43.

Discusser.

Fourthly, I aske, were not these Elders and Ministers of the Church of Ephesus sufficiently furnished from the Lord Jesus, to drive away these spirituall, and mysticall wolves?

Defender.

They were furnished with sufficient power to cast them out of the Church, but being cast out, they had not sufficient power to drive them away from conferring with, and corrupting the members of the Church, or other Godly ones out of the Church. It is no dishonor to Christ, nor impeachment to the sufficiency of the Ordinances left by Christ, that in such a case, his Ministers of Justice in the Civill State, should assist his Ministers of the Gospel in the Church-State.

Discusser.

Fifthly, lastly I Aske, whether (as men deale with wolves) these wolves in Ephesus were intended by Paul to be killed, their braines dashed out with stones, staves, Halberds, Gunns &c. in the hands of the Elders of Ephesus?

Defender.

No: nor was it alledged by me for any such end, nor indeed alledged by me at all: but onely the Discusser is pleased to set up a mark, to shoot at for his owne recreation. Elders must keepe within the bounds of their calling: But killing, and dashing out of Braines (which is all one with stoning) was expressly commanded, in such a case, to the People of God (by order from the Judges:) *Deut. 13. 10.*

Discusser.

But comparing spirituall things with spirituall things, spirituall & mysticall wolves, should be spirituallly and mysticallly slaine.

Defender.

So they should be by the spirituall Officers, and members of the Church. But in destroying Religion they are also disturbers of the Civill State, and accordingly are to be dealt withall by

Civill Justice. *Achan* disturbed the Common-wealth, as well as the Church of *Israel*, by bringing a Babylonish garment into the Tents of *Israel*: and was therefore troubled himselfe, for troubling the Peop'e of the Lord, *Josh. 7. 25.*

Discusser.

It is a most bloody Doctrine, The wolves (Hereticks) are to be driven away, their braines knocked out, and killed, the poore sheep to be persecuted for whom Christ died.

Defender.

Belike it is a milkey, and peaceable, and Gospel like Doctrine, The wolves (Hereticks) are to be tolerated, not an haire to be struck off from their heads, but for the poore sheep, for whom Christ died, let them perish, unlesse Christ mean to preserve them himselfe alone, with his own immediate hand: no care of preserving them belongeth to the Civill Magistrate.

Discusser

Is not this to take Christ, and to make him a temporal King by force? Joh. 6. 15. Is not this to make his Kingdome of this world? to set up a Civill and Temporall Israel? to bound out new earthly holy lands of Canaan? yea and to set up a Spanish Inquisition in all parts of the world, to the speedy destruction of millions of soules, and to the frustrating of the sweet end of the comming of the Lord Jesus, which was to save mens soules (and to that end, not to destroy their bodies) by his owne blood?

Defender.

Now of all these: when the Kingdomes of the earth become the Kingdomes of the Lord (*Rev. 11. 15.*) It is not, by making Christ a temporall King, but by making temporall Kingdomes nursing Fathers to his Church. In the dayes of Christs flesh it was Incompatible to his Ministry to make him a King (as they went about to doe *Joh. 6. 15.*) Christ hath enjoyed (even as Mediator) an everlasting Kingdome, not onely in the Church, but in the Government of all the Kingdomes of the earth, by his glorious power, and righteousness. But the Kingdomes of the earth are then said to be the Kingdomes of our Lord, when they submit their lawes to the lawes of his word. But that neither maketh him a temporall King, nor his Kingdome in the Church to be a Kingdome of this world. The Church and Common-wealth are still distinct Kingdomes, the one of this world, the other of Heaven

Heaven: and yet both of them from Christ, unto whom the Father hath committed all Judgement, *Iob. 5. 22.*

Neither will this set up a Civill and temporall *Israel*, an holy *Canaan*, unlesse all the members of the Common-wealth were called to be members of the Church, and subject to all the ceremoniall, and all the judiciall Lawes of *Moses* (not onely those of Morall, and perpetuall equity,) but peculiar to that State, as the Brother to marry his deceased Brothers wife.

Nor is it a Spanish Inquisition, to preserve the sheep of Christ from the raven of wolves: but this rather, (such is the practise of the *Discusser*) to promote the principal end of the Spanish Inquisition, to advance the Romish tyranny, Idolatry, and Apostacy, by proclaiming impunity to all their whorish and wolvishe Emissaries.

Nor is it a frustrating of the sweet end of Christs comming, which was to save soules, but rather a direct advancing of it, to destroy (if need be) the bodies of those wolves, who seeke to destroy the soules of those, for whom Christ died, and whom he bought with his owne blood.

C H A P. 44. A Reply to his Chap. 44.

Discussing 2 Cor. 10. 4.

Discusser.

The next Scripture produced against such persecution was 2 Cor. 10. 4. The weapons of our warfare are not carnall, but mighty through God &c.

To which it is Answered, Paul speaketh of the weapons of Apostles, and Church-Officers, which are not carnall, but spirituall, and mighty through God. But this denieth not, Civill weapons of Justice to Civill Magistrates. But I here observe, that the Scripture holdeth forth a two-fold State, a Civill State, and a Spirituall: Civill Officers, and spirituall: Civill weapons, and spirituall: Civill vengeance, and spirituall: though the Spirit speaketh not here expressly of Civill Magistrates, and their Civill weapons: yet these States being of different natures and considerations (as farre differing as flesh and spirit) therefore Civill weapons are most improper and unfitting in matters of the
Spirituall

spirituall Kingdome and State, though in the Civill State most proper and suitable.

Defender.

The Discusser, as often throughout his Discourse, so here he looketh himselfe, and the truth, in ambiguities. Civill weapons are indeed improper, and unfitting in spirituall matters, to wit, in the dispencing, and pressing of spirituall matters for the immediate producing of spirituall ends, as for a Magistrate to draw his sword to compell all his Subjects to the obedience of the faith in Christ, and to the profession of it. But this is not unfitting nor improper, That a Magistrate should draw his sword, though not in matters spirituall, yet about matters spiritual to protect them in peace, and to stave off the disturbers, and destroyers of them. It were improper and unfitting, for carpenters to bring their Axes and Hammers to build up the spirituall Kingdome and Church of Christ: But yet their tooles are fitting to build up scaffolds, that the people may draw neere to heare the Word, & by hearing, be brought on to faith and salvation.

CHAP. 45. A Reply to bis 45. Chap.

Discusser.

TO Batter and take a strong Hold, or Fort, men bring not a fist and second Admonition, and after obstinacy, Excommunication: But they bring Canons, Culverings, Sakers, Bullets, Powder, Musquets, Swords, Pikes, weapons suitable and proportionable. On the other side, to batter downe Idolatry, false worship, Heresy: out of the soule and spirit, It is vaine, Improper, unsuitable to bring the usual weapons of persecutors, Stocks, Whips, Prisons, Swords, Gibbets, Stakes: But against these spirituall strong holds in the soules of men, spirituall Artillery, and weapons are proper, and mighty through God to subdue every thought to obedience.

Defender.

Let this stand (as it shall for me:) It nothing toucheth the Question in hand. It is farre from me to allow the Civill Magistrate to make use of his Civill weapons to batter downe Idolatry

try, and Heresy in the soules of men: but for this end, he is to use spirituall weapons, and all Lenity and wisdom: in the improvement thereof: But if the Idolater or Heretick grow obstinate & as the Apostle saith, waxe worse and worse deceiving himselfe and others, to the destroying or corrupting and disturbing of others, now the Magistrate maketh use, not of Stocks, and Whips (for these doe not remove, but exasperate the malady:) but of Death, or Banishment, that may cut him off from opportunity of spreading the leaven, and Gangerne of his pernicious wayes, whether in Doctrine, or practise. It is one thing to speake of Heresie and Idolatry in the Abstract: another in the Concrete. Heresie, Idolatry and all spirituall wickednesse, cannot be rooted out of the hearts of the sonnes of men, but by spirituall weapons. But Hereticks, and Idolaters may be restrained from the open practise, and profession of their wickednesse by the Sword of Justice, and such weapons of Righteousnesse.

Discusser.

But though these weapons were proper: yet they are unnecessary. For if spirituall weapons in the hand of Church Officers, be able, & mighty, and sufficient, and ready for the Lords worke, either to save, or to kill the pule &c. How doth the Magistrate come in to help, but as if the Lord had no power?

Defender.

This is a meere pretence in the mouth & pen of the Discusser: For he having cut off all the Churches of Christ, and all Church Ordinances, and Church-weapons from off the face of the earth for these many ages past, and I know not for how many yeares yet to come: If Civill weapons be debarr'd from defending Religion, upon pretence, that Church-weapons are sufficient, and and then no Churches nor Church-weapons to be found upon the face of the earth, then let all Seducers to Apostacy, Idolaters, & Hereticks, let them all rejoyce in an open doore of liberty, & safety, which the Discusser hath set wide open before them. If Civill States must not, and Churches cannot, come in to helpe the Lord, shall the curse of *Meroz* be so avoided, because the Lord wanteth not power to help himselfe? But I might reply further, that though spirituall weapons are mighty through God, and sufficient to those ends, for which the Lord appointed them: which

which are to purge out leaven from their holy communion, and to mortify the flesh of offenders: yet that is not superseades to Civill Magistrates, to neglect to punish those sins, which the Church hath censured, if the persons censured do proceed to subvert the truth of the Gospel, or the peace of the Church, or the salvation of the people. The rest of the Discussers discourse in this chapter are (as *Jude* speaketh) clouds without water, words without matter.

CHAP. 46. A Reply to his Chap. 46.
Discussing Rom. 13.

Discussor.

This Scripture Rom. 13. which is pleaseth the Answerer to quote, how hath both himselfe, and many excellent servants of God, wrested (not as Peter writeth of the wicked to their eternall, yet) to their own and others temporall destruction by civill warres, and combustions in the world?

Defender.

This charge is a greivous crime, if it be truly proved: a greivous slander, if it be not proved.

The rest of the Chapter proveth it not, but that onely which I willingly graunt, that this 13th Chapter to the *Romans* exhorteth unto subjection to Magistrates, & unto love to all men: which are duties pertainning to the second Table. Howbeit though subjection to Magistrates, and love to all men be duties which concerne the second Table (a point which needed no prooffe :) yet this inference will not here follow, That therefore Magistrates have nothing to doe to punish any violation, no not of the weightiest duties of the first Table. It is a cleare case, amongst the duties of the second Table, people may be exhorted to honor their Ministers, and children may be exhorted to honor their Parents. But will it thence follow, that therefore Ministers have nothing to doe with matters of Religion in the Church, or parents in the Family?

CHAP. 47. A Reply to his Chap. 47.

Discusser.

THere be excellent and precious servants of God in their time, who have absolutely denied the 13. of the Rom. to concerne any matter of the first Table.

Defender.

I will not stand upon the last use in that Chapter, put you on the Lord Jesus Christ: which I hope the Discusser himselfe will not deny, much lesse say, that any Excellent and precious servants of God, doe absolutely deny, that such a Duty concerneth the first Table. But what is it that the servants of God say?

Discusser.

Calvin saith, this whole Discourse concerneth Civill Magistrates: and therefore in vaine doe they who exercise Power over Consciences, goe about from this place to establish their sacrilegious Tyranny.

Defender.

Calvins Judgement herein (as generally in other points) is sound and agreeable to the Text: but not at all favouring the Discussers Imagination. This whole Disputation (saith he) is of Civill Governments: whereupon this inference is (according to his owne true meaning and scope) therefore it doth not concerne Church-Government. Therefore such Church-Governours as upon pretence of this Text doe make Lawes, without the word, and besides the word, to bind Conscience, and to usurp power over Consciences, they in vaine goe about to establish their sacrilegious Tyranny from this place. But what is this to the point in hand? Church-Governours doe in vaine goe about from this place to establish their Sacrilegious Tyranny by giving Lawes without the word, and beside the word to bind Conscience: Therefore Civill Magistrates, (of whom this whole Discourse is) shall exercise a sacrilegious Tyranny over the Conscience, and in vaine goe about to establish it from this place, when from the word of God, they establish true Religion, and goe about to punish the Fundamentall subverters of the same. But how farre off Calvins Judgement was to restraine Civill Magistrates from meddling in matters of Religion, let him interpret himselfe in his own words

words (in his opusculs) in his Answer to Servetus, who was put to Death for his Heresies at Geneva by his procurement. Hoc uno (saith he) contentus sum, Christi adventu; nec mutatum esse Ordinem Politicum, nec de Magistratum officio quicquam Detractum.

Ageat quod Paulus docet, Rom. 13. 4. Non frustra ab ipsis Gladium gestari, an ad speciem unam restringi debet? Fatentur isti, quibuscum nunc Discepto ad alia crimina plectenda Judices divini, esse amatos, modò à Religione abstineant, ut libera, ipsis tacentibus, Impietas lasciviat: verum reclamant innumeris locis Spiritus Sanctus, &c. This one thing (saith he) sufficeth me, that by the coming of Christ, neither was the State of Civill Government changed: nor any thing taken away from the Magistrater Office. Goe to then, that which Paul teacheth (Rom. 13. 4.) that he beareth not the Sword in vaine, ought it to be restrained unto one kind onely? they themselves confesse with whom I have to deale, the Magistrates are armed of God to punish other crimes, so that they abstaine from matter of Religion, that so ungodlynesse may runne riot by their connivance. But the Holy Ghost crieth out against this in many places, &c.

Discusser.

Againe, Calvin speaking of fulfilling the Law by Love, writeth thus on the same place, Paul hath not respect unto the whole Law, he speaketh onely of those duties, which the Law commandeth us towards our neighbours. And after Paul only mentioneth the second Table, &c. And thus he repeateth, Love is the fulfilling of the Law, understand it as before, of that part of the Law which concerneth humane Society: for the former Table of the Law, which is of the worship of God, is not here touched.

So Beza upon the word ἀγαπάς, (if there be any other Commandement, it is summed up in this, thou shalt love thy Neighbour as thy selfe) the whole Law, (saith he) commandeth nothing, but the love of God, and our Neighbour: but since the Apostle in this place discourseth of the mutuall Duties of men one to another, I thinke this Terme, Law, ought to be restrained to the second Table.

Defender.

And so think I too, yet without the least prejudice to the cause in hand. For if the Question be of the duties which Subjects owe to Magistrates, they pertain to the second Table: or if the Question be of the vertue of love one to another, That it is the fulfilling of

of the whole Law, It is meant chiefly of the second Table: though withall it be true, the second Table cannot be fulfilled without fulfilling of the first Table also. These things are out of controverſie. But what is all this to the point in hand? The Apoſtle in calling love the fulfilling of the Law, ſpeaketh of the Law of the ſecond Table. Ergo, the Magiſtrate (who is ſpoken of in the ſame chapter.) hath no power to puniſh the crimes againſt the firſt Table? or thus further, in the 13. of the *Romans*, the Apoſtle ſpeaketh of the Duties of Subjects to Magiſtrates (which is a Duty of the ſecond Table:) therefore Magiſtrates have no power to puniſh their Subjects for crimes againſt the firſt Table?

The *Diſcuſſer* might as well argue, that the duties of Subjects to Magiſtrates, are duties of the ſecond Table: therefore it is not the Dutie of Subjects to pray for their Magiſtrates, which is a Duty of the firſt Table? The Truth is, though Prayer be a Duty of the firſt Table; yet to pray for Magiſtrates, is a Duty of the ſecond Table. In like ſort, though Idolatry, and Blaſphemy, and Hereſie be finnes againſt the firſt Table: yet to puniſh theſe with civill penalties is a Duty of the ſecond Table. For let it be conſidered in the feare of God, are not all Duties of Righteouſneſſe to man commanded in the ſecond Table, as well as all Duties of Holineſſe to God, commanded in the firſt Table? If ſo, I demand againe, whether it be not a Duty of Righteouſneſſe belonging to the people of God, to enjoy the free paſſage of Religion, Truth of Doctrine, Holineſſe of worſhip, Purity of Church-Government? I demand yet further, if it be not an injurious dealing to the people of God, to diſturb the Truth of Doctrine with Hereſie? the holineſſe of worſhip with Idolatry? the Purity of Government with Tyranny? If all theſe be granted, then it unavoidably followeth, that all theſe wayes of unrighteouſneſſe are juſtly puniſhable by the ſecond Table. Let not therefore the *Diſcuſſer* pleaſe himſelfe in deluding himſelfe, and the world, that *Beza*, and *Calvine* did abſolutely denie the 13. of the *Romans* to concerne any matter of the firſt Table. For though the Duties of Loyalty to Magiſtrates, and of love to all, concerne the ſecond Table, yet it was neither the word nor Judgement of *Calvine*, or *Beza*, ſo to interpret *Rom. 13.* As to exempt Magiſtrates from Power of puniſhing Hereſie, and Idolatry. *Calvines* Interpretation

pretation of Rom. 13. 4. and his Argument from thence against Servetus, is declared above in this chapter. Heare now how Beza interpreteth the same Text in his Booke entituled *De Hereticis, & Magistratu puniendis*. Testatur Paulus Magistratum esse Dei Ministrum qui Gladium gerat ad eas ulciscendas, qui male agunt, Rom. 13. 4. *Quamobrem alterutrum necesse est, si in Hereticos Magistratus jus nullum habet, vel ipsos male non agere (quod Refutatione indigere non puto) vel, quod in genere Paulus ait, ad certum malefactorum genus revocandum, eorum videlicet, quae corporalia peccata vocant, de quo malefactorum discrimine, copiosius, ut spero, posset, suo loco Disserram.* That is, Paul witnesseth faith be, that the Magistrate is Gods Minister, who beareth the Sword to take vengeance on them that doe evil, Rom. 13. 4. wherefore one of these two must needs be, If Magistrates should have no just power over Hereticks, either that Hereticks are not evill doers (which is so grosse, that I thinke, it needs no Refutation) or else that Pauls speech is to be restrained to a certaine sort of evill deeds, to wit, such as they call corporall sinnes: of which distinction of evill deeds, I shall dispute more largely, I hope in his due place hereafter. So Beza.

CHAP. 48. A Reply to his Chap. 48.

Discusser.

THe higher powers in this Rom. 13. were (amongst others) the Roman Emperours, and subordinate Magistrates under them. But they all were strangers from the life of God, yea most averse and opposite, yea cruell, and bloody Persecutors of the Name and followers of Jesus: and yet unto these is subjection commanded.

Now then I argue, If Paul had commanded this subjection to Romane Magistrates in spirituall causes to defend the Truth, to punish Hereticks, (neither of which they could discern nor judge of, but by Trust from others, as Pilate condemned Jesus) he must in the Judgement of all men, have put out the eye of Faith, and Reason, and sense at once.

Defender.

Not in the Judgement of all men, for besides Calvin and Beza (whose Judgement you have heard) all those Interpreters, who expound

expound this place in the *Romans*, of the Magistrates power in punishing spirituall evill doers, as well as corporall, they, none of them doe so judge, that *Paul* in commanding the Churches to yeild subjection unto civill Magistrates in matters of Religion, did put out the Eye of Faith, and Reason, and sense at once.

For first, it is one thing to yeild subjection to the unrighteous Decrees of Ignorant, and Pagan Magistrates: another thing to obey their Ordinances in matters of Faith, and worship, and Government of the Church. The former of these, Christians did yeild unto the Romane Magistrates, even subjection unto the Death: the other, they neither did, nor ought to yeild: as knowing God was to be obeyed rather than men.

Secondly, though it be true, whilst the Romane Emperours and Magistrates were Pagans and Persecutors, they were incompetent Judges, to discern and give Sentence in the spirituall matters of Christian Religion: yet the word of Christ, who commandeth a Duty, commandeth all the necessary meanes, which tend to that Duty. And therefore in giving them a Power and charge to execute vengeance on evill doers, (and that in matters of spirituall unrighteousnesse against the Church, as in matters of Civill unrighteousnesse against the Common-wealth) It behoved them to enquire and listen after true Religion, to heare and trie all, and upon serious, deliberate, and just scruting to hold fast that which is good, and so prevent the disturbance thereof by the contrary. It was no vaine charge of the Holy Ghost, *Psal.* 2, 10, 11, 12. If Christ have an Iron Scepter in his hand (to crush all States, and Kingdomes, Emperours, and Princes, as well as private persons) *Be wise now therefore o yee Kings: be instructed yee that are Judges of the Earth, serve the Lord with feare, rejoyce unto him with trembling. Kisse the Sonne lest he be angry, and yee perish in the way.*

Thirdly, the cases of Religion, wherein we allow Civill Magistrates to be Judges, are so fundamentall, and palpable, that no Magistrate studious of Religion in the feare of God, but, if he have any spirituall discerning (as all truly Christian Magistrates have, and even Pagans have discerned between innocent Christians, and turbulent Seducers) he cannot but judge of such grosse corrupti-

ons as are unsufferable in Religion, as hath been opened above. Though we reserve to the Prophets and Churches *Judicium Propheticum*, as hath been said above: yet we allow *Judicium Politicum*, to Civill Magistrates studious of Truth (as all ought to be) and the Judgement of Discretion unto all Christians. But as for such Magistrates as are meerely naturall and Pagan, though Christians be bound to subject themselves unto them with patience: yet such Magistrates ought to forbear the exercise of their Power, either in protecting, or punishing matters of Religion, till they have learned so much knowledge of the Truth, as may enable them to discern of things that differ.

But this forbearance of theirs is not for want of Authority in their callings, nor for want of Duty in their Consciences, but for want of evidence to them in the cause. In which Case, Magistrates are wont to forbear their exercise of their Power, and to respite Judgement even in Civill causes, not for want of Authority, or Duty, to doe Justice: But for want of ripe and full cognizance of the Cause.

CHAP. 49. A Reply to his Chap. 49.

Discusser.

VHy then did Paul himselfe appeale to Cæsar (Acts 25.) unlessse that Cæsar (though he was not yet, yet he) ought to have been a fit Judge in such matters?

Ans. Paul appealed to Cæsar, not to judge the cause of his Religion: but to defend him from civill violence, and slanderous accusations about sedition, mutiny, civill Disobedience, &c. From which Cæsar (as a supreme civill Magistrate) ought to defend him.

Defender.

This appeale of Paul to Cæsar doth evidently hold forth three things.

1. That there is a lawfull and needfull use of civill Magistracy unto Christians.
2. That Church Officers (even of highest ranck) the Apostles themselves, and other Ministers are subject to civill Authority, as well as private Christians.

3. That

3. That Paul did submit to Cæsars Judgement-seate: the tryall of his innocency, as well in matters of Religion, as in civill conversation. For he pleadeth his innocency, that he was guilty in none of those things whereof they did accuse him, and for tryall hereof he appealeth to Cæsar, ver. 11. Now the things whereof they did accuse him, were offences against the Law of the Jewes, and against the Temple, as well as against Cæsar, ver. 8. And offences against the Law of the Jewes, and against the Temple, were matters of Religion. And yet even in these Paul appealeth to Cæsars Judgement-seat for tryall of his innocency.

Discusser.

But if Paul in this Appeale to Cæsar had submitted his Religion (which was the cause of Christ) his Ministry, and Ministration, to the Romane Emperours Tribunall, he had sinned. First, against the light of Reason. Secondly, against the cause of Religion. Thirdly, against the holy Calling of a Christian. Fourthly, against his owne calling of Apostleship. Fifthly, against the holy name of God, &c.

Defender.

All these finnes might with some colour have been charged upon Paul, if he had appealed to Cæsar, to Judge, whether his Religion, or Ministry, or Ministration were of God, or no. But that was no point of his Appeale: But whether his Religion, or Ministry, or Ministration were guilty of any capitall crime against the Law of the Jewes, or against the Temple, or against Cæsar. Now in this case Paul might safely appeale to Cæsar, and that to the Honour of God, of his Apostolick and Christian Calling, and to the glory of his Religion. The Reasons against Pauls Appeale in this case are but bul-rushes.

CHAP. 50. A Reply to his Chap. 50.

Discusser.

HAVING dispatched two Arguments (against the founding of the civill Magistrates power in spirituall causes, in Rom. 13. First, from the Testimony of Calvin and Beza: the second from Cæsars incompetency and insufficiency to Judge of spirituall matters.)

I come now to the third Argument, taken from the nature of the Magistrates weapons: he hath a Sword, and that Sword is a civill Sword, a Sword of civill Justice which being of a materiall and civill nature, serveth for the defence of Persons, Estates, Families, Liberties of a City, or civill State, and for the suppressing of uncivill and injurious Persons, or Actions by civill punishment. And therefore this Sword cannot extend now (as it did in Israel of old) to spirituall and soule causes, to spirituall and soule punishments.

Defender,

I easily hold with the *Discusser*, that the civill Sword doth not extend to spirituall and soule punishments. But if the civill Sword ought to extend to the defence of civill men in civill Liberties, then why not also to the like defence of Churches, and spirituall persons in their spirituall Liberties? It is the Office of the civill Magistrate to governe his people in righteousness. And if spirituall Liberties be in righteousness due to spirituall persons, as well as civill Liberties to civill persons, doubtlesse the Magistrate is defective in Rules of righteousness, if he onely attend the defence of the civill people, in their civill Rights, and neglect to defend his spirituall people in their spirituall Rights.

What though the Sword be of a materiall and civill nature? so it was in the Old Testament, as well as in the new. It can therefore reach no further, either then or now, then unto the punishment of men, in bodily life, or civill Liberties: But it can reach to punish in these things not onely the offenders in bodily Life, and civill Liberties, but also the offenders against spirituall Life and soule Liberties.

What though it be called a civill Sword in common speech? It is not a Scripture-phrase, so to call it: It may as fitly be called the Sword of God, as well as the Sword of warre is so called (*Judges 7. 20.*) which the *Discusser* (guilefully, or else unskillfully) distinguisheth in this chapter from the civill Sword. Now if the Sword of the Judge, or Magistrate, be the Sword of the Lord, why may it not be drawne forth, as well to defend his Subjects in true Religion, as in civill Peace?

And as Magistrates are called (in common speech) civill Magistrates: so are they called also in the Language of the Sanctuary) Gods, *Psal. 82. 1. 6* If civill Magistrates are to attend to
civill

civill matters : are not Gods to attend to Gods matters ? It was wont to goe for a good Argument *à conjugatis, homo sum, humani nihil à me alienum puto*. But now (by the Discussers Doctrine) the Magistrate may say, *Ego (dignatione Divinâ) Deus sum* (Psal. 82.) *quatenus autem Deus sum; Divina omnia à me aliena puto*. Now farre be all such reasonlesse, and Paganish, yea worse then Paganish, Atheology from us. Worse then Paganish I say, for Pagan Princes accounted their Religion their chiefe care, *prima cura sacrorum*. And can a Christian forbid the care of Religion to Magistrates, I say not, without blushing, but without trembling ?

Object. But Magistrates were called Gods in the Old Testament, not so in the New. Now under Christ all Nations are meere Civill, without any such Typicall holy respect upon them as was upon Israel a Nationall Church.

Ans. It is written in the New Testament, the Kingdomes of the world are become the Kingdomes of the Lord, and of Christ, Rev. 17. 15. And if the Kingdomes be Gods Kingdoms, and the Kingdomes of Christ, then the Kings of those Kingdomes, are Gods Kings, and Christian Kings. and what Title is there in all the New Testament that either derogateth from the Titles, or Office of Kings ?

Though the Nations now have not that Typicall holinesse, which the Nation of Israel had : yet all the Churches of the Saints, have as much Truth and reality of holinesse, as Israel had. And therefore what holy care of Religion lay upon the Kings of Israel in the Old Testament, the same lyeth now upon Christian Kings in the New Testament, to protect the same in their Churches.

CHAP. 51. A Reply to his Chap. 51.

Discussor.

A Fourth Argument from this Scripture (Rom. 13.) I take (in ver. 6.) which is a meere civill reward for the Magistrates worke. Now as the wages be, such is the worke, but the wages are meere Civill, Custome, Tribute, not the contributions of the Saints or Churches of Christ, &c.

P

Defender.

Defender.

The Contributions of the Saints and Churches, are truly called by the Apostle carnall things; *Romans 15. 27.* and againe, *2 Cor. 9. 11.* But shall a man therefore thus reason, as the wages be, such is the worke: But the wages are carnall things: therefore such is the worke of the Ministers of the Gospel, to whom such wages are paid? It is true the contributions of the Saints, may be called Holy, because they are given to God, and (by his appointment) to the maintenance of such as minister in his house about his holy things: But these are mentall relations, no reall differences in the things given to Magistrates, and Ministers: The wages given to them both, are carnall things. And consider them both in their proper ends: as the rewards given to Ministers, are given for their service about holy things: so the rewards given to Magistrates are given for their service about righteous things. Now if the Purity of Doctrine, worship, and Government be righteous priviledges of all the Churches in the Common-wealth, surely Magistrates doe not well deserve all their wages, that suffer the Churches to be bereaved, and dispoyled of their spirituall priviledges, which is the greatest and best part of their Birth-right.

Besides, the Apostle commandeth the Churches, and Saints not onely to pay to Magistrates, Tribute, and Custome, (which are civill things:) but also to poure out all manner of Prayers, and Supplications, Intercessions, and given of thanks for them, *1 Tim. 1. 1, 2.* And surely these are spirituall dues, and not Earthly. And therefore Magistrates owe to the Churches, and Saints some Spirituall recompences, which the Apostle also therenameth, that we may live a quiet and peaceable Life in all godlinesse and honesty, *ver. 2.* If therefore the Churches and Saints be not suffered to live a quiet and peaceable Life in Godlinesse and honesty: or if they be suffered to live a quiet and peaceable life in ungodlinesse and dishonesty, the Magistrates fall short of returning Spirituall recompence for the spirituall Duties and services performed for them.

Dissolver.

Firstly, that the Spirit of God never intended to direct or warrant the Magistrate, to use his power in spirituall affaires and Religions, I

argue

argue from the Terme, or Title given by God, to such civill Officers, to wit, Gods Ministers, ver. 6.

Defender.

One would thinke the Argument would rather evince the contrary. For what is a Minister, but a Servant? and what is a servant, but he that is at his Masters command (for his efficient cause:) and for his Masters ends, as his finall cause? How shall then a Magistrate carrie himselfe, as a Minister of God, and yet fall short (and intended to doe) both of Gods Commandments in his Lawes? and of Gods worship, and glory in the execution of them?

Discusser.

But at the very first blush, any man will acknowledge a double Ministry: the one appointed by Christ in his Church, to order the affaires thereof, Ephes. 4. 1 Cor. 12. The other a Civill Ministry or office, merely humane and Civill, which men agree to constitute, (therefore called an humane Creation, 1 Pet.) and is as true and lawfull in those Countries, that never heard of the true God, and his holy Sonne Jesus, as in any part of the world, where the Name of Christ is not taken up.

Defender.

If Magistrates be the Ministers of God (as Paul calleth them) then their Ministry or office is not merely humane, but as the Apostle saith, it is of God, and ordained of God, Rom. 13. 1. And if it be of God, it must also be for God: or else he is a Minister and servant not of God, but of the world. It is true, men agree to constitute it, to wit, this or that forme of it (in respect of which influence of men, it is called an humane Creation:) but the Truth is, Government it selfe is of God, and ordained by God, and every lawfull forme of Government (whether Monarchy, Aristarchy, or Democracy, or some mixt of these, according to the State of the People) they are all of God, and so acknowledged, and authorized by God in his word, and though they be as true and lawfull in those Nations that never heard of the true God, or of his holy Sonne Jesus: yet it was from the guidance and appointment of God in the very light of Nature, that such Nations did erect such and such Governments, and Governments for the good of humane society, and that not onely in worldly matters, But in matters also of Religion.

Whence it is, that in all civill Nations, whose *Acts* are recorded, either in sacred or prophane Authors, their Magistrates have had not onely a due care of Justice and honesty, but a reverend care of Religion also: *Joseph* in *Egypt* provided for the preservation of the Lands of the Priests without Impeachment, and that not out of respect to their superstition (which he could not but dislike:) but out of regard to the *Egyptian* Lawes, & Customs, to preserve their Religion, and the maintenance thereof, inviolate, *Gen.* 47. 22. In *Babell*, *Nebuchadnezzar* being convinced of the soveraigne Divinity of the God of *Israel*, made a capitall Law against the blasphemers of his Name, *Dan.* 3. 29. *Darius* of the *Medes* and *Persians* enacted a Royall Law to like purpose, *Dan.* 6. 26. The likedid *Artaxerxes*, *Ezra.* 7. 26. and *Darius* before him, *Ezra.* 6. 11. In *Athens* they had a Law against *Ariston*, Irreligion, upon which suffered three famous Philosophers, *Socrates*, *Theodorus*, and *Protagoras*. *Socrates*, as *Laertius* reporteth in his Life, was accused by *Melitus* the *Athensian*, who commenced his Action against him in these words *Ἀδύναμι ζῶντα θεῶν, ἔστιν ἡ Πλάσι ποιεῖν θεοὺς, ὃν οὐκ ἔστιν, ἀποφαίνεσθαι καὶ ἀνθρώπων νόμους ἀντιτιθέναι τοῖς θεοῖς.*

Theodorus was firnamed *Atheos*, and as *Socrates* was condemned to death by poyson, so was this man also, as *Laertius* reporteth out of *Amphicrates* in the life of *Aristippus*. *Protagoras*, (as *Tully* reporteth of him, *de Natura Deorum Lib.* 1.) having thus expressed himselfe in the beginning of his Booke, concerning the Gods (I have not to say, whether they be, or whether they be not) his Bookes were publickly burnt, and himselfe banished out of City and Country. How the *Ephesians* stood affected to the destroyers of their Religion, appeareth by the excuse which the Towne-Clarke made for *Paul* and his Companions, you have brought these men hither saith he, which are neither robbers of Churches, nor yet blasphemers of your Goddesse, *Acts* 19. 37. The *Romans* how zealous they were in defence of their Religion, the slaughter of many thousand Christians will be a perpetuall Monument to all Ages. All which things I recite not to justifie the misapplying of their zeale to the maintenance of false Gods, but to make it appeare, that as the Pagan Nations who never heard of the true God, and of his Sonne *Jesus*, did erect by instinct of Nature, Governments, and Magistrates: so by the same instinct, their

their Lawes and Magistrates tooke care of the maintenance of that Religion, which they tooke to be of God. What a shame were it, that Pagan Magistrates should be more carefull and zealous of the honour of their Idols, then Christians of the Honour of the knowne true God, the Lord our Creator, Redeemer, and Sanctifier?

CHAP. 52. A Reply to his Chap. 52.

Discusser.

MAny object out of ver. 4. of Rom. 13. that the Magistrate is to avenge evill: and therefore Heresies, false Christs, &c. But I answer, First, that the word is generally opposed to civill goodnesse, or vertue in a Common-wealth, and not to spirituall good.

Secondly, I have proved, here as not intended evill against the spirituall or Christian State (handed in chapter 12.) But evill against the Civill State, handed in this 13. chapter.

Defender.

What is meant by τὸ κακόν, evill, no man (that I meet with) Interpreteth more fully then Pareus. There is, saith he, a foure-fold evill, of which the Magistrate is the Avenger: contrary to the foure-fold good, whereof the Magistrate is the Preserver. A naturall good, a Morall good, a Civill good, a spirituall good. A naturall good, as Life, and safety of our bodies: A morall good, as Temperance, Chastity: a Civill good, as our goods and Lands, and civill Liberties: A spirituall good, as the free passage of the Ordinances of God, and pure Religion. In opposition to these there is a foure-fold Evill: Naturall, as the killing, and wounding, and beating of our bodies: morall as Drunkennesse, and whoredome: Civill, as stealth, and robbery, and oppression: Spirituall, as Heresie, Idolatry, and disturbance of the free passage of Gods Ordinances. As the Magistrate is bound by his office to preserve the good of the Subject in all these kinds: so is he to avenge the evill done against the Subject in any of these.

What the Discusser hath proved to the contrary (as he saith) hath been Answered already in his place.

Discusser.

The Elders of New-England grant, the Magistrate may not punish

punish some evils, as the secret finnes of the Soule: nor finnes handled in the Church in a private way: nor such finnes as are private in Families. As the complaints of Children against Parents, Servants against Masters, Wives against Husbands: nor such finnes as are between the Members, and Churches themselves. From whence I observe,

1. That the Magistrate is not to punish all evil.
2. I observe, how they take away from the Magistrates that which is proper to his cognizance, as the complaints of Children, servants, Wives, against their Parents, Masters, Husbands, &c.

Defender.

When wee say, the Magistrate is an Avenger of evil: we meane of all sorts, or kindes of evil: not every particular of each kinde: secret evils, in thought, or affection, yea in action too: but neither confessed, nor proved by due witnesses: the Magistrate cannot punish.

Discusser.

The distinction of secret, or private, and publick evil, will not be availe: because such as urge the Terme evil (viz. that the Magistrate is to punish evil) they urge it strictly, eo nomine, because Heresie, Blasphemy, &c. is evil, &c.

Defender.

But not simply because it is evil, unless it be also notorious, and evident, and convicted by sufficient witnesses, and held forth with publick offence, and disturbance. Neither doe the Elders ride away from the Magistrates, the cognizance of the complaints of Children, Servants, wives, against Parents, Masters, Husbands.

Unless they be merely private, and easily healed in a private way, by Domestickall Government, what need household Government, if every Family-offence should be brought to the cognizance of the publick Magistrate? one Ordinance of God doth not swallow up another.

CHAP. 53.

A Reply to his Chap. 53, 54, and 55.

Discusser.

THe Author of the Letter proceeded to a last Reason from Scripture, to prove that the Disciples of Christ should be so farre from persecuting, that they ought to blesse them that curse them, and pray for them that persecute them: and that because of the freenesse of Gods grace, and deepnesse of his Counsels, calling home them that be Enemies, persecutors, no people, yea some at the last houre.

Unto this Reason the Answerer is pleased thus to Reply.

First, in generall, we must not doe euill that good may come thereof.

Secondly, in particular, he affirmeth that it is euill to tolerate seditious euill doers, seducing Teachers, scandalous liuers; and for prooffe of this, quoth Christs Reproofe of the Angels of Pergamus, and Thyatira, for tolerating Balaam, and Jezabel, to teach, and seduce, Revel. 2. 14. 20.

Defender.

The Discusser forgetteth himselfe, through Incogitancy, (if not through guile) when he maketh this to have been my first Reply, that we must not doe euill that good may come thereof. For he is not ignorant, that I gave two Answers. (or Replies as he calleth them) before, in the same place.

First, when Christ commandeth his Disciples to blesse them that curse them, and persecute them, he giveth not therein a Rule to publicke Officers, whether in Church, or Common wealth, to suffer notorious sinners, either in Life or Doctrine, to passe away with a Blessing: but to private Christians, to suffer persecution patiently, yea and to pray for their Persecutors.

Againe, it is true, Christ would haue his Disciples to be farre from persecuting, (for persecution is a wicked oppression of men for Righteousnesse sake:) but that hindereth not, but that he would haue them execute upon all Disobedience, the Judgement and vengeance required in the Word, 2 Cor. 10. 6. Rom. 13. 4.

Both these Answers the Discusser passeth over in silence. For looke, as Children where they cannot read, thinke it best to skip over:

over: so men of riper yeares, when they are loath to stoop to the Authority of the Truth, they thinke it best to passe it over in silence. But what is it, the *Discussor* is pleased to answer to?

Discussor.

In this Proposition, [that it is evill to tolerate notorious evill doers, seducing Teachers, scandalous livers:] I observe two evils.

First, that this Proposition is too large and generall, because the Rule admitteth of exception, and that according to the will of God.

Defender.

And to prove that this generall Proposition admitteth some exception, the *Discussor* spendeth the rest of this 53. chapter: as also the 54th. chapter, and 55th.

But because I would not spend time, nor weary the Reader with following the *Discussor* in impertinent, and copious digressions, I returne briefly this Reply.

First, it is wholly impertinent, whatsoever the *Discussor* is pleased to discourse of Gods permission, or toleration of any evill.

For first, God is his owne Rule, and what he doth is good, because he doth it. Not his Act, but his word, is a Rule to us. He may tolerate *Cain*, a Murtherer to live; but that is no precedent to a Civill Magistrate.

Secondly, I willingly grant, it may be lawfull for a Civill Magistrate, to tolerate notorious evill doers in two cases, under which, all the Examples will fall, which the *Discussor* alleadgeth in any word of Truth.

As first, in regard of the efficient cause of punishing; when the Magistrates hand is too weake and feeble, and the offenders Adherents so great and strong, that Justice cannot be done upon him, without manifest perill to the whole State, there the Magistrate may tolerate a notorious evill, even murther it selfe, as *David* upon this ground did tolerate in *Joab* and *Abisbai*, the murther of *Abner*. 2 Sam. 3.39.

And secondly, in regard of the finall cause, an evill may be tolerated to prevent other greater evils: As *Moses* tolerated divorce of displeasing Wives, to prevent the murder, or other hard and cruell usage of them.

In either of these cases, I would not deny but a murderer may be tolerated: if either the Magistrate want sufficient Power, with safety

safety of the State, to cut him off: or if a forraine State be so affected and addicted to the Murderer, that in case the Magistrate here cut off him, they will cut off sundry of our innocent and necessary members, whom they have gotten into their custody in revenge of him.

And if either of these be the case, I easily grant that it is not evill to tolerate a notorious seducing false Teacher, or other scandalous liver: But such an extraordinary doth not hinder the due largenesse, and generality of the Proposition, that it is evill to tolerate seditious evill doers, seducing Teachers, scandalous Livers. As in a paralell case, this Proposition is not too large, nor too generall; it is evill to tolerate a bloody murderer: notwithstanding in some cases (such as have been named, but those are extraordinary) it may be lawfull to tolerate him.

Now that in ordinary cases, it is not lawfull to tolerate a seducing false Teacher, the Commandement of God is cleare, and strong, *Deut. 13. 8, 9. Thine eye shall not pity him, neither shalt thou spare him, neither shalt thou conceale him, but thou shalt surely kill him.*

If the Discusser shall except, that strict Commandement was in force in Israel, because their Land was typically holy, or their Magistrates were Types of Christ.

The Reply is plaine and just, God himselfe alledgeth no such reason of his Law: But another quite different, but common with them to all Nations, professing the worship of the true God, *Thou shalt put him to death, because he sought to thrust thee away from the Lord thy God, ver. 10.*

Neither can any instance be given of any Capitall Law of Moses, but is of Morall, (that is of generall, and perpetuall) Equity, in all Nations, in all Ages, *Capitalia Mosis Politica sunt eterna.*

CHAP. 54. A Reply to his Chap. 56.

Discusser.

I Come now to the second Evill, which I observe in the Answerers former Position, that it would be evill to tolerate seducing Teachers, scandalous Livers.

In two things, I shall discover the great evill of this joyning and comp-
ling

Q

ling seducing Teachers, and scandalous Livers, as the proper and adequate object of the Magistrates care and worke to suppress and punish.

Defender.

I no where make it the proper and adequate object of the Magistrates care and worke, to suppress, and punish seducing Teachers, and scandalous livers. For I have expressly said it, and proved it before, that it is, and ought to be the care and worke of the Church also to suppress and punish seducing Teachers, and scandalous livers, in a Church-way, as well as the Magistrate, in a civill way.

Discusser.

First, this joyning of things of such different kinds, is not an homogeneous, but heterogeneall commixture of things most different in kind.

Defender.

But these different kinds, they agree in one common kind: they are both of them evils, and evils destructive in their severall wayes to the common good of Gods people, which ought to be preserved both in Church and Common-wealth. The termes of Homogeneous and Heterogeneous, are in this case only words of noyse, and of an empty sound, fit to take with simple people, that know not the meaning, nor use of them.

Discusser.

Who knoweth not, that many seducing Teachers of the Paganish, Jewish, Turkish, or Antichristian Religion, may be cleare and free from scandalous offences in their lives, and from disobedience to the civill Lawes of the State?

Defender.

Now you may see the Discusser was willing to make use of sounding words, which himselfe (it seemeth) knew not well the use of. For what if there were many seducing Teachers of all Religions, that may be cleare from scandalous offences? the distinguishing therefore of evils into these two sorts, into seditious Teachers, and scandalous offenders, is so much the more allowable, and accurate. If a man shall say the worke of the Creation on the sixth day, was either of man, or of Beast: shall a man goe about here to observe a great evil, that here is not an homogeneous, but an heterogeneall commixture of things most different in kind? For who knoweth not that there are many Beasts, Lyons, Leopards, Wolves, Beares, that never were men, but are cleare and free from all humane nature?

Such a like reasoning is that of the Discusser here. What if many seducing

seducing Teachers, whether *Jewish, Paganish, Turkish, Antichristian*, were never scandalous livers, but obedient to the civill State? yet are they not all of them evill? and accordingly to be restrained by lawfull Authority? And is the joyning of them together the great evill of an heterogeneous commixture?

Again, let the *Discusser* be pleased to observe (that which hath been often touched afore) that we looke at it, as more tolerable, for seducing Teachers to seduce those who are already in the same gall of bitterness with themselves, as *Pagans* to seduce *Pagans*, *Jews* to seduce *Jews*, *Turkes* to seduce *Turkes*, and *Antichristians* to seduce *Antichristians*. Though this also ought to be prevented by wise and wholesome meanes, by a Christian Magistrate in all those that are under his dominion, so far as there is power in his hand, without the hazard of the publick State.

Lastly, let me adde this *Reply* to the rest, that it will be hard for the *Discusser* to finde *Antichristian* seducers cleare and free from Disobedience to the civill Lawes of a State, in case that *Antichrist* (to whom they are sworne) shall excommunicate the civill Magistrate, and prescribe the civill State to the invasion of Forrayners.

Discusser.

Again, who knoweth, not that a seducing Teacher properly sinneth against the Church, & against the Spirituall State and Lawes of it? and therefore ought most properly and anely to be dealt withall in such a way.

Defender.

These twise-sod Coleworts, the *Discusser* hath often set them before us heretofore: but with as little savour now, as before. For what if a seducing Teacher having sinned against the Church, be cast out by the Church, and still continue seducing? yea what a weake and guiltfull evasion, would this prove for the *Discusser*, to referre a seducing Teacher to a Church-way, when himselfe doth not acknowledge any Church of Christ extant upon the face of the Earth?

Discusser.

A second evill, which I observe in coupling seducing Teachers with scandalous livers, is a silent and implicit Justification of all unrighteous and cruell proceedings of *Jews*, and *Gentiles* against all the Prophets of God, the Lord *Jesus* himselfe, and all his messengers and witnesses, whom their Accusers, have ever so coupled and mixed with notorious evill doers, and scandalous livers, &c.

Q 2

Defender.

Defender.

Is this a silent and implicate Justification of all the injurious and cruell handlings by wicked men of the Lord Jesus, and his witnesses, to say, that seducing Teachers, and scandalous livers are to be punished by Authority, because the Lord Jesus himselfe, and his witnesses have suffered under those names? What if the wicked *Jewes*, and *Gentiles* did injuriously and blasphemously put those names upon the Lord Jesus, and his faithfull witnesses, and upon pretence of such evils put them to death? doth it therefore justify such proceedings, to say, that seducing Teachers, and scandalous livers are to be punished by Authority? If those who are indeed seducing Teachers, and scandalous livers ought to be punished, will it therefore justify the like proceedings against them who are no such persons, but falsely so called? if a man should say, a murderer is to be punished with death, will it therefore justify the *Islanders* & *Militia*, to put *Paul* to death, because amongst them he was so reputed, doubtlesse a murderer? *Acts* 28. 4. yea let the *Discusser* seriously consider, whether this kind of reasoning of his, doe not more then silently and implicately testifie, that the Lord Jesus and his witnesses, were seducing Teachers and scandalous livers.

CHAP. 55. A Reply to his Chap. 57.

Discusser.

THe Scripture alleaged by the Answerer, to prove that it would be an evill, to tolerate notorious evill doers, whether seducing Teachers, or scandalous livers, is written, *Rev.* 2. 14. 20. Where Christ bath something against the Church of Pergamus, for tolerating them that hold the Doctrine of Balaam: and against the Church of Thyatira, for tolerating Jezebel, to teach and seduce.

Unto which I may answer with some admiration and astonishment, how it pleased the Father of Lights, and most Jealous God, to darken and vaile the eyes of such a man, as not to seeke out, and propose some Scriptures (in the prooffe of so weighty an assertion) as at least might have some colour for the influence of the civill Magistrate in such cases. For these Texts concerne neither the City, nor the civill Magistrates of Pergamus, and Thyatira, but the Churches, and Elders, &c.

Defender.

Defender.

It was no part of my meaning, to alledge those Scriptures, to prove it unlawfull for Magistrates to tolerate seducing Teachers, but unlawfull for Churches.

If the *Discusser* say there needed no proöfe of that, that was out of Question.

I may truly tell him, that was more then I knew. For the Letter which he intreated me to Answer) so stated the Question, as in generall to argue against persecution for cause of Conscience. And if the Question be put in such generall Termes, I knew the Church might as well be complained of for persecution for cause of Conscience, as the civill Magistrate. For if persecution be taken properly for affliction or oppression for righteousnesse sake I knew it was out of Question, all persecution was unlawfull, whether by the Church, or the Magistrate: an unjust excommunication is as true persecution, as an unjust Banishment. But if persecution be taken more largely, and loosely, (as it is by the Author of the Letter, and by the *Discusser*, for any affliction, or persecution for cause of Conscience (whether good Conscience, or evill, whether rightly informed, or erroneous) If that be the intent of the Letter (as it seemed to me) to beare witnesse against that, then any testimony of Scripture, that justifieth a lawfull censure of false and erroneous Teachers, doth evince the scope of the Letter to be erroneous, which is against all persecution for cause of Conscience. Let therefore the *Discusser* admire at his owne admiration, and be astonished at his owne astonishment, that wondereth to see an universall negative argued against by a particular affirmative.

The Letter denyeth the lawfulnessse of all persecution in cause of Conscience, that is, in matter of Religion: I seek to evince the falsehood of it, by an instance of lawfull Church-prosecution in case of false Teachers.

Discusser.

But if the Churches and Angels thereof had sufficient power to suppress Balaam, and Jezabel, then all power of Magistrates and Governours in Pergamus and Thyatira (though they had been Christian) must needs fall to the ground, as none of Christs appointment.

Defender.

The power of the Churches and Angels, of Pergamus, and Thyatira, were sufficient for those ends, for which Christ ordained Church-

Church-power : to wit, for the healing of the soules of such seducers, (if they belonged to Christ) as also for keeping those Churches pure from the fellowship of the guilt of their Act (in teaching false Doctrines) whom they had duly censured. But the power of those Churches and Angels was not sufficient to prevent the further spreading of the Leaven of their false Doctrines, both in such as were out of the Church, and in private, amongst the members of the Church, who might adhere to them. Much lesse was the pressing forth of the Church-power against them sufficient to clear the Magistrates of a Christian State from the guilt of Apostasie, in suffering such Apostates amongst them, who would be ready to sollicite many simple soules, either to withhold and withdraw themselves from the Fellowship of the Churches, or in the Churches to withdraw from the Lord Jesus.

Discusser.

Lastly, from this perverse wresting of what is writ to the Church, and the Officers thereof, as if it were writ to the Civill Officers, and States thereof, all may see how since the Apostacie of Antichrist the Christian world (so called) hath swallowed up Christianity, how the Church, and Civill State, that is, the Church and the world are now become one flock of Jesus Christ, &c.

Defender.

Here is no wresting, much lesse perverse wresting of any Scripture at all, from the Church, to the Civill State. I intended to apply the Scripture written to the Churches, and to the Officers thereof, no further then to other Churches, and their Officers. The Scriptures upon which we call in the Magistrate to the punishment of Seducers, are such as are directed to civill States, and Magistrates, of which divers have been mentioned, and applied before.

CHAP. 56.

A Reply to his Chap. 58, and 59. Discussing the Testimony of some Princes.

Discusser.

I Proceed to the second Head of Reasons (against persecution for cause of Conscience) taken from the profession of famous Princes, King James, Stephen of Poland, King of Bohemia.

Unto

Unto whom the Answerer returneth a treble Answer.

1. Wee willingly acknowledge, (saith he) that none is to be persecuted at all; no more then any may be oppressed for righteonsnesse sake.

Again, we acknowledge, that none is to be punished for his Conscience, though misinformed, unlesse his error be fundamentall, or seditiously and turbulently promoted, and that after due conviction of his Conscience, what it may appeare, he is not punished for his Conscience, but for sinning against his Conscience.

Furthermore, we acknowledge, none is to be constrained, to believe or professe the true Religion, till he be convinced in Judgements of the truth of it: but yet restrained he may be from blaspheming the Truth, and from seducing any into pernicious errors.

This first Answer, I believe, I have sufficiently cleared the weaknesse of the Foundations thereof in the former discourse.

Defender.

And I doubt not, but by the help of Christ, I have formerly declared and convinced the feebleness of the opposition made against them, and what firme foundations those Answers are built upon, from the Scriptures of Truth.

Discusser.

His second Answer is this, what Princes professe and practise is not a Rule of Conscience. They many times tolerate that in State Policy, which cannot justly be tolerated in point of true Christianity.

Again, Princes many times tolerate Offenders out of very necessity, when the Offenders are too many, or too mighty for them to punish. In which respect David tolerated Joab and his murder, but against his will.

It may be here observed, how the Answerer dealeth with Princes, one while, they are nursing Fathers to the Church, not onely to feed, but also to correct; and therefore consequently, bound to judge, what is true feeding and correcting: and consequently all men are bound to submit to their feeding and correcting.

Defender.

The Discusser doth partly fallly, and partly fraudulently fasten upon me this dealing with Princes. That I make them nursing

nursing Fathers of the Church, I therein follow the footsteps of the Holy Ghost before me, teaching what Princes should be, and foretelling what they shall be in the latter dayes, *Isaiah 49. 23.* In which place, It was not the intent of the Holy Ghost, (nor mine) to threaten the Church with a rod of Correction: But to comfort the Church with a double blessing: First of the Fatherly provision and protection of Princes for the Church: Secondly, of their subjection to the Church, in respect of their spirituall Estate. What Princes may doe, in case the Church should Apostate, and become no Church: or in case they should breake forth into Sedition, and Rebellion against the Civill State, It is another Question, which I have not medled with, in all this Discourse. Neither have I spoken of Princes, as bound to Judge, what is true feeding, or correcting: least of all have I said, that all men are bound (especially in Conscience) to their feeding, and correcting. These are calumnies devised by the *Discusser*.

All I have said (to my remembrance) this way, is, that Princes are bound to be wise, and Learned with holy knowledge that they may kisse the Sonne, and be subject to him, *Psal. 2. 10. 11.* And therefore able to discerne of such corrupt feeding, as destroyeth the Foundation of Religion, and the soules of Gods people, that they may be able to restraintsuch, and to preserve the Church from such ravenous Wolves: and I deny not that their Subjects are to submit to them herein; when they judge according to the Word; or howsoever patiently to suffer for well-doing, without resistance, in a way of Hostility, notwithstanding any Church-power. If ought be unsound in this dealing with Princes, I am willing to heare of it.

Discusser.

Another while, when Princes crosse Mr. Cottons Judgement, and Practise, then it matters not, what the Profession and Practise of Princes is: for, (saith he) their Profession and Practise is no Rule to Conscience.

Defender.

If Princes swerve from the rule of the word, either in profession, or practise,

practise, their owne profession, or practise is no rule either to themselves, or others. Princes ought not to rule the word, but are to be ruled by it. But see the notorious calumny, of the Discusser, so representing M^r Cottons dealing with Princes, as if he made his owne judgement and practise the rule of the proceeding of Princes. Men whose tongues are their owne, may speake any thing: But yet such as feare the Lord, would tremble at such speeches, as neither expresse Truth, nor Love.

Discusser

I aske then, unto what Princes or Magistrates, will themselves, or any so perswaded, submit to, as unto keepers of both Tables, and nursing Fathers, and Mothers, to the Church?

First will it not evidently follow by these Tenents, That they ought not to submit to any Magistrates in the world, in these cases, but to Magistrates just of their owne Conscience?

Defender.

We subject our selves to all sorts of Magistrates of the Countries where we live, or whether we come, whether Christian, or Pagan, Orthodox, or erroneous, just of our Consciences, or unjust against them. Subject our selves, I say, either in active submission, and obedience, when they command according to God: or in passive submission, of our bodyes, and goods, lives, and liberties, when they command against God. Since the Discusser concludeth, it will evidently follow, that wee will submit to no Magistrates, but just of our owne Consciences. let him make that evident, which he saith, is evident, or else, let him say, he is evidently mistaken, *né quid dicam gravius.*

Discusser.

Secondly, will it not also follow, that all other Consciences in the world, (except their owne) must be persecuted by such their Maiistrates?

Defender.

This will no wayes follow, unlesse all mens Consciences in the world did erre Fundamentally, and obstinately after just conviction, against the very Principles of Christian Religion, or at least, unlesse they maintained, and held forth other errors (though not Fundamentally subverting Religion, yet Fundamentally subverting Church-Order, and civill order) and that in a turbulent,

and Factionous manner. For in these cases only we follow Magistrates to punish in matters of Religion.

Discusser.

And Lastly, Is not this to make Magistrates, but steps, and stirrups for themselves, to ascend and mount into their rich, and honorable Seates, and Saddels? I meane, great and settled maintenances, which neither the Lord Jesus, nor any of his first Messengers, the true Patternes did ever know.

Defender.

How this power ascribed to Magistrates, not by me, but by the body almost, of all Faithfull Ministers, yea by the Prophets and Apostles themselves, should make Magistrates staires, and stirrups, for our selves to mount up so high, let him that can discern it, make it appeare. To allow them power over our selves in case of Hereticall Delinquency, is not to make them staires, or stirrups of our advancement, but Swords, and staves (if need be) for our punishment.

Besides, I wonder what fancy came into the Discussers minde, to dreame of rich and honorable Seates, and Saddels of our Magistrates? When as he need not be ignorant, how farre short they themselves fall, of rich and honorable Seates and Saddels, which himselve interpreteth, great and settled maintenances.

Lastly, I suppose, he is not ignorant, that my selfe against whom he is pleased by Name to write this invective, liveth not upon great and settled maintenance, but according to that which he calleth, the true patterne of the first Messengers of the Lord Jesus.

C H A P. 57. A Reply to his Chap. 60.

Discusser.

IN the second place, the Answerer saith, that Princes out of State-Policy, doe sometimes Tolerate, what suiteth not with Christianity: and out of State-necessity Tolerate (as David did Joab) against their will.

But then the Answerer must acknowledge with me, That when

is a necessity sometime of State-Toleration, as in the case of Joab. And so his former affirmation, generally lay'd downe, [viz, That it is evill to Tolerate seducing Teachers, and Soandalous Lives,] Was not duely weighed in the ballance of the Sanctuary, and is too light.

I easily acknowledge sometime a necessity of State Toleration, As I have formerly expressed (in Chap. 53.) especially in two cases, whereof that of Joab is one.

But that will nothing impeach the Truth of my former affirmation delivered in generall termes, especially, if it be weighed in the Ballance of the Sanctuary. For the holy writings of the Sanctuary doe expressly deliver the like position, in like generall termes. As Moses saith, who so sheddeth mans blood, by man shall his blood be shed. This Law is delivered in generall termes: and yet though Joab was a murderer, he was tolerated to live all the Reigne of David: yet I hope the Discusser will not say, that generall Law of Moses was not duely weighed in the Ballance of the Sanctuary, and is too light.

Discusser.

I affirme Secondly, That that State-Policy, and State-necessity which permitte Consciences of men, will be found to agree most punctually with the Rules of the best Politition, that ever the world saw, the Lord Jesus himselfe, who commanded the permitting of the Tares, to wit, Antichristians, or false Christians with true Christians, as I have discoursed above.

Defender.

That discourse hath bin examined above, and found too light, so farre as it crosseth the Truth returned in Answer to the Letter. To permit some Antichristians, or false Christians, The Answer to the Letter did allow: unlesse they maintained Fundamentall Heresies against the Foundation of Religion, and that obstinately, after conviction, and did withall seduce others, into the same Apostacy.

But as for such Hereticks, and seducing Teachers, I hope, it hath been cleared, they are none of those Tares, of which Christ saith, Let them alone.

Besides, it is an Interpretation of Christs words formerly given, and not to be reversed, That if by Tares were meant, such

grosse offenders, then the speech of Christ. Let them alone, is not a word of command in way of an Ordinance, but a word of Permission, and prediction, what will be, in way of Providence. Like that in *Luk. 22. 36.* He that hath no sword, let him sell his Garment and buy a sword, It is not a word of command, or direction, what the Disciples should doe; But a word of prediction, what times of tryall they should meet withall.

C H A P. 58. A Reply to his Chap. 61.

Discusser.

His Third Answer is this.

FOR those three Princes named by you, who Tolerated false Religion, we can name more and greater, who have not Tolerated Hereticks and Schismaticks, notwithstanding their pretence of Conscience, and Arrogating the crowne of Martyrdome to their sufferings.

Constantine the great at the Request of the generall Council of Nice, Banished Arius, with some of his fellows, *Ecclesiast. Histor. l. 1. Cap. 19. 20.*

The same Constantine made a severe Law, against the Donatists: & the like proceedings against them were used by Valentinian, Gratian, & Theodosius, as Augustine reporteth in *Epist. 166.* onely Julian the Apostate graunted liberty to Hereticks as well as to Pagans, that he might by Tolerating all weeds to grow, choake the vitalls of Christianity: Which was also the practise and sinne of Valens the Arian.

Queene Elizabeth, as famous for her government, as most of the former, It is well knowne what Lawes she made, and executed against Papists: Yea and King James (one of your owne Witnesses) though he was slow in proceeding against Papists (as you say) for Conscience sake, yet you are not ignorant, how sharply and severely he punished those, whom the Malignant world calleth Puritans, men of more Conscience & better Faith, then the Papists, whom he Tolerated.

Discusser.

First, for mine owne part, I would not use an Argument from the number of Princes, witnessing in profession, or practise, against persecution.

tion for cause of Conscience, &c. Truth, and Faith, must not be received with respect of persons: pretious pearles are found in muddy shells. The most High chooseth the poore of this world, to be witnesses to his Truth: and Buchanan dying was going thither, whether few Kings were coming.

Defender.

This Chapter then might have been spared: for it neither maintaineth his cause, nor refuteth my answer to his friends Argument: but yeeldeth up the invalidity of the Argument from such a Topick place, As from the number and votes of Princes. But by his leave, the answer which I gave to his argument is not taken from the like number of Princes, but from the greater piety, and presence of God with those Princes, who have professed and practised against Toleration. It is truly said, *Suffragia non sunt numeranda, sed ponderanda*. Heroicall wisdom, magnanimity and zeale, is not the lesse to be esteemed, because it is found in the spirit, and counsel, and practise of Princes.

CHAP. 59. A Reply to his Chap. 62.

Discusser.

Secondly, I observe, how inconsiderately (I hope not willingly) the Answerer passeth by the reasons and grounds, urged by these three Princes.

In King James his speech, he passeth by that golden Maxime, that God never loved to plant his Church by blood.

Defender.

The Discusser is mistaken, when he saith I passed over their reasons and grounds inconsiderately, though he hopeth, not willingly: for indeed I passed them over willingly, but not inconsiderately. For I well considered, either the reasons wanted weight, or else did not impugn the cause in hand. For instance, this speech of King James (That God never loved to plant his Church by blood) though it be a Truth of weight: yet it doth not touch this cause. It is farre from us, to defend the planting of Churches.

Churches by blood: that is, to compell men to yeeld themselves to the fellowship of the Church by bloody Lawes, or pœnalities: the Church of Christ admitteth no members, but a willing people, *Psal. 110. 3.* Neverthelesse that hindereth not, but as the Church was purchased and planted by the blood of Christ: so he that shall goe about to supplant, and destroy the Church of Christ, his blood may justly fall upon his owne head.

Discusser.

Secondly, That civill obedience may be performed by Papists: this was another reason of King James passed over by the Answerer.

Defender.

No marvell, that I passed it over: for I did not finde it in the Letter. For though the King say (as the Letter reporteth him, I onely declared, to be secured for civill obedience: which for Conscience cause, they were bound to performe:) yet the King doeth not say, That civill obedience may be performed, by Papists, standing stedfast to the rules of their owne Religion. For if the Bishop of Rome, upon pretence of hereticall pravity, shall excommunicate a Protestant Prince, dissolve the Subjects Oath of Allegiance to him, depose him, dispose of his Kingdome: In this case (whch often falleth out) how can civill obedience be performed by the Papists?

Discusser.

Thirdly, The Kings third ground is his observation in Revel. 19. That persecution is a true & certaine note of a false Church: The wicked are Beseigers, the faithfull Beseiged.

Defender.

I subscribe to the King that persecution (properly so called, that is, the oppression of any for righteousness sake) is a note of a false Church: but not a certaine note. For againe, I say, that persecution properly so called, may be sometime found, in the true Church. For which of all the Prophets did not the Church of the old Testament persecute? *Acts 7. 52.*

And yet that persecution was not the true and certaine note of a false Church: For then God had left no true Church upon the face of the earth. But this I grant, That such persecution, where ever it is found, It is a degree of falshood and Apostacy in that Church. But what a vast distance is there between the just censure of

of Apostaticall, and Hereticall seducers, and disturbers of the Churches peace and truth, and between persecution?

As for the other speech [The wicked are beseigers, the faithfull are beseiged] It may well be said of the seige spoken of in that 20. of the *Revelation*: But if it should be put for a universall Maxime, Royall Authority cannot make it good Divinity. When the ten Christian Kings shall hate the Whore of Rome, and eate her flesh, and burne her with fire. (*Rev. 17. 16.*) I suppose the Discussor will not say, the wicked are Beseigers, the faithfull are beseiged.

Discussor.

In King Stephens speech of Poland, he passeth by the true difference, between a civill, and a spirituall Government. I am (said Stephen) a civill Magistrate over the bodies of men, not a spirituall over their soules.

Defender.

King Stephens speech may well stand, and the cause still untouched. The Magistrate is a Ruler over the Bodies of men, not over their soules: He cannot command their soules, nor binde their Consciences, nor punish their spirits. It is the Lord alone can reach them. That which the King or Magistrate can doe, or doeth in this case, is to punish the bodies of men for destroying, or disturbing Religion.

Discussor.

To confound these, is Babel: and Jewish to seeke for Moses and bring him from his Grave, &c.

Defender.

It is Babel indeed, for civill Magistrates, to make Lawes to binde Conscience, and to excommunicate transgressors of those Lawes: But to punish false Prophets, and Seducers of Gods people to Idolatry, was never the practise of Babel: but it was, and is their practise, not onely to Tolerate them, but to advance, and encourage them.

If it were a Jewish seeking of Moses, and a bringing him from his Grave, to punish Seducers for Idolatry, then after Moses was buried, that Law (*Deut. 17.*) was abrogated. But his buryall, and Gods hiding of the place thereof, was rather a confirmation, and establishment of it, then any Abrogation, or Impeachment of

of it. For may it not justly be conceived, That the Lord therefore hid the place of his buriall, least the Children of Israel knowing it, might goe a whoring after his Sepulchre, and it may be offer sweet incense upon it: and so such false worship against the law of *Moses* might come to be Tolerated, for honor to the body of *Moses*.

But Christ hath abolished a Nationall State, or Church, which *Moses* set up in Canaan.

Though Christ abolished a Nationall Church-State, and instead thereof set up a Congregationall Church: yet Christ never abolished, a Nationall Civill State, nor the Judiciall Lawes of *Moses*, which were of Morall equity, but established them rather, in their place and order. He that shed his own blood to plant his Church, did never abolish that Law, which enacted, that his blood should be upon him, who should supplant his Church. If Christs blood goe to plant it, let the false Christs blood goe for supplanting it.

Discusser.

In the King of Bohemias speech, the Answerer p'ssers by that Foundation in grace and Nature, that Conscience ought not to be violated, and forced, it is a spirituall Rape.

Defender.

This was not passed by, but prevented in stating the Question, where it was said, it is not lawfull to censure any, no not for error in Fundamentall points of Doctrine or Worship, till the Conscience of the offender, be first convinced (out of the word of God) of the dangerous error of his way, and then if he still persist, It is not out of Conscience, but against his Conscience (as the Apostle saith Tit. 3. 11.) & so he is not persecuted for cause of Conscience, but punished for sinning against his Conscience.

Discusser.

The King observeth that most lamentably true experience of all ages, That persecution for cause of Conscience, hath ever proved pernicious, &c.

Defender.

No experience in any age did ever prove it pernicious, to punish seducing Apostates, after due conviction of the error of their way. Wherein did the burning of *Servetus* prove pernicious

ous

ous to Geneva? or the just execution of many popish Preists to Queene Elizabeth, or to the english State?

But the Kings speech may passe, if it be meant of persecution properly so called, to wit, Oppression of the faithfull, for the Truths sake: yea if it be the punishment of any for error, If not Fundamentally pernicious either to Religion, or Church-order, and that after conviction of Conscience, persisted in with obstinacy.

Discusser.

Lastly, the Kings observation of his owne time, that Persecution for cause of Conscience, was practised most in England, and such places, where Popery reigned: Imphying (as I conceive) such practises commonly proceed from the great Whore, whose Daughters are like their Mother, all of a bloody nature, as commonly all wolves be.

Defender.

It is no marvell, if I passed by this observation in the Kings speech: For there is no such observation there to be found. If the Discusser had well observed it himselfe, he would have found, it was not the speech of the King, but of the Prisoner.

And the persecution, he speaketh of, was not of Antichristians, or Hereticks, or Idolaters, but onely of such as the world nicknamed Puritans, or the like, and of them too, without conviction of the error of their way.

But in that the Discusser maketh England a Daughter of the great Whore, and of a bloody nature, like her Mother: he speaketh as some other of the rigid Separation have done before him. But I could never yet see a warrant (from the rule either of Truth, or Love) for such a speech. Did ever the holy Scripture, call any Church an whore, that worshipped the true God, onely in the Name of Jesus, and depended on him alone for righteousness and salvation? Is it not the part of a base childe, or at least, a base part of a childe, to call his Mother whore, who bred him, and bred him to know no other Father but her lawfull Husband, the Lord Jesus Christ?

C H A P. 60. A Reply to his 63. Chap.

Discusser.

NOW Thirdly, In that the Answerer observeth, that amongst the Romane Emperors, they that did not persecute were Julian the Apostate, and Valens the Arian: Whereas the good Emperors, Constantine, Gratian, Valentinian, and Theodosius, they did persecute the Arians, and Donatists.

Let it be for an Answer, It is no new thing for godly, and eminently godly men to performe ungodly actions: nor for ungodly persons, for wicked ends, to act what in it selfe is good and righteous, &c.

Defender.

This may goe for a truth, but not for an Answer. The Letter would Justifie Toleration of Religion from the judgement and speeches of three Kings. I Answered that was no Argument, for I could bring him Kings more in number, and greater in the sight of God and man, who judged it meet not to tolerate Hereticks, nor turbulent Schismaticks,

To this the Discusser Answereth, sometimes the Godly doe that which is evill, and the wicked, that which is good. This I say is a Truth, but doth not take away my Answer, but by a *Petitio Principij*, a begging of the Question, That Kings alledged by him did that which was good, but the Kings alledged by me, though better persons, did that which was evill.

C H A P. 61. A Reply to his Chap. 64.

Discusser.

THe unknowing zeale of Constantine and other Emperors did more hurt to Christ Jesus, his Church and Kingdome, then the raging fury of the most bloudy Neroes. In the persecution of those wicked Emperors, Christians were sweet and fragrant, like spice pounded in Morters: But those good Emperors persecuting some erroneous persons, and advancing the Professors of some truthes, and maintaining their Religion

Religion by the materiall Sword, by this meanes Christianity was eclipsed. The Professors of it fell asleepe (Cant. 5.) Babel was usker'd in, and by degrees the Churches of the Saints were turned into the Wilderness of whole Nations, (Rev. 12. 13.) untill the whole world, became Christian, or Christendome. Those good Emperors intending to exalt Christ, but not attending to the command of Christ Jesus, to permit the Tares to grow in the Field of the world, they made the Garden of the Church, and Field of the world, all one &c.

Defender.

Is the unknowing zeale of Constantine, & other Christian Emperors did more hurt to the Church, then the raging fury of bloody Neroes: It was not because the raging fury of those Persecutors was more accepted of God, then this unknowing zeale of the good Emperors. For though the unknowing zeale of the one was finfull, yet it was the fruit of humane frailty, *Error Amoris*: But the rage of the others was diuelliſh fury, *Amor Erroris*. Besides the unknowing zeale of the good Emperors, lay not in punishing notorious Hereticall Seduceers; nor will the Discusser be ever able to shew, that the Church of Christ suffered any hurt at all by that meanes. The contrary is evident, *Constantinus*, and *Valens* by Tolerating and favoring the *Arians*, the whole world became *Arian*; *Ingenuit orbis Christianus, et miratus est factum se esse Arianum*. Now whether be the greater mischeife the whole world to become *Arian*, or to become Christian. Let Christians judge. The Discusser indeed speaketh of it, as a soliscisme in Religion, that the whole world should become Christian, and quoteth for it, *Rev. 12.* and *13.* But *Rev. 12.* speaketh nothing to the purpose; and *Revel. 13.* speaketh of it, as a marvellous euill, that the whole world should wonder after the Beast, ver. 3. But their wondering after the Beast, not a becoming Christian (for they were that before) nor did it spring onely from the unknowing zeale of Christian Emperors in persecuting Apostate Hereticks: But rather from their sinful Indulgence in the Toleration of Hereticks in Doctrine, and Idolaters in Worship. For had they been zealous, and watchfull against such, how is it possible, that ever Antichrist should have been hatched up, to carry the world after him into such a notorious Apostacy? It was not persecution, that made the world, Christian: but Toleration, that made

made the world, Antichristian. Furthermore, the hurt of the unknowing zeale of good Emperors did to the Church, came in also another way, by advancing Church-Officers to Mountaines of high preferments, and settled indowments, Rev. 8. 8, 9. The Church never tooke hurt by the punishment of Hereticks. Moreover, when God advanced *Constantine* and other good Emperors to sit on the Throne, It is true, the Church soone became a wilderness: but that came not to passe because those Emperors forced Pagans into Church-Fellowship by the materiall Sword (as the Discusser intimateth, but untruly) But because the common sort are willing to follow the example of great ones, *Regis ad exemplum totius componitur Orbis*: as also because of the sleepe-nesse of the watchmen (the Elders of the Churches) who should not have suffered such store of Tares to come into the communion of the Church. Had the world renounced their Paganisme, and professed Christ to be the Sonne of God, but yet had been kept out of the Fellowship of the Church, till they had approved their profession by a sincere Christian conversation. It had been no soliscisme at all (howsoever the Discusser judge of it) though the whole world had been come—Christian, and stiled Christendome. But it is too grosse and palpable a mistake, to make this the cause why the Garden of the Church, and the Field of the world became all one, because the zeale of Christian Emperors intending to exalt Christ, did not attend to the command of Christ, to permit the Tares to grow in the Field of the world.

For they did permit them to live in the Field of the world, they seldome or never put any to death for Hereticall pravity (though it had bin better they had so done with some of them:) But onely exiled them from such Cities and Countreyes as were most Populous, where if they had continued, they might have had too great an opportunity of spreading their leaven, which (as the Apostle speaketh fretteth like a Gangrene, 1 Tim. 2. 17.

C H A P. 62. A Reply to his Chap. 65.

Discusser.

I Desire you to glance your eye on this not unworthy observation, how fully this Answerer hath learned the Language of Lyon like Persecution &c. for thus he writeth, more and greater Princes then these you mention, have not Tolerated Hereticks, and Schismaticks, notwithstanding their pretence of Conscience, and their Arrogating the Crowne of Martyrdome to their sufferings.

Tis true, these termes Hereticks (or wilfully obstinate) and Schismaticks, are used in holy writ: tis true also, that such pretend Conscience, and Arrogate the Crowne of Martyrdome to their sufferings. But this is the common clamour of Persecutors against the witnesses of Jesus in all ages, you are Hereticks, Schismaticks, factious, Seditious, rebellious.

Defender.

If it be true, that these be Scripturè termes, and by his owne acknowledgement truly applyable to Hereticks and Schismaticks, then, it seemeth, the Discusser hath learned this Language of *Ash-dod*, that the Scripture it self, and Truth it selfe speaketh the roaring Language of Lyon-like Persecution. For he acknowledgeth, the Scripture useth the same termes, and Truth verifieth the same things. In Summe, It is as much to say, as Paul had learned the roaring and railing Language of Lyon-like *Pharob*: *Pharob* told the Children of *Israel*, yee are idle, yee are idle, *Exod. 5. 17.* And Paul had learned to say as much to the *Cretians* by his Letter to *Titus*, *The Cretians are alwayes liars, evill beasts, and slow bellies. Tit. 1. 12.* But is it so indeed? may not the same reproofe unjustly cast npou Gods servants, be justly applyed to Gods enemies, when (by the Discussers owne confession) it may be applyed truly? If Persecutors misapply Scripture Termes, & rebukes to Christs Witnesses falsely, may not a servant of God apply the same truly, as the Scripture applyeth them, but he shall be thought to learne to speake not the Language of Scripture, but the Language of persecutors?

Discusser.

Ob it is hard for Gods Children to fall to Opinion and practise of Persecution,

Persecution, without ready learning the Language thereof. And doubtlesse that soule, that can so readily learne Babels Language, hath cause to feare that he hath not yet in Point of Worship left the gates or suburbs of it.

Defender.

If this Language used by me be the Termes of Scripture, and by the acknowledgement of Truth rightly applyed, then it is the Language of *Canaan*, and not of *Babel*. What Language they have learned, who in point of Worship, have left *Zion*, but not the gates and Suburbs of *Babel*, (for they set up Bulwarks or Impunity, to secure them) Let themselves (in the feare of God) consider.

But what Language is it to speake of me, as having learned the opinion & practise of persecution, I desire the God of Truth to teach him to know, It is the Language of him that stood not in the Truth, and of such also, as call evill good, and good evill.

Disseuer

Againe in blaming *Julian the Apostate*, and *Valens the Arian* for Tolerating all weeds to grow, benoteth their sinfull end, that thereby they might choake the vitalls of Christianity: and seemeth herein to consent (on a speech of *Jerome*) That the weeds of false Religions tolerated, have a Power to kill true Christianity in the Church.

But when Christianity began to be choaked, It was not when Christians lodged in cold Prisons, but Downe-Beds of ease, and Persecuted others.

Defender.

I noted indeed the sinfull end of *Julian the Apostate* in tolerating all Religions and Heresies, to aime at the choaking of the vitalls of Christianity. Of *Valens* I noted the like sinfull practise of Tolerating all Religions: but did not expresse his end. But what I spake of the end, concerned *Julian*: and I spake of it not of mine owne imagination, (though he that shall read the stories of his Apostacy, and malignity against the Name of Christ, and Christians, might easily beleive and speake it without rashnesse:) but I speake it out of a grave and judicious Author, who lived neere those times, I meane *Augustine*, who in his 166. Epistle, thus exp. ceth *Julian* both practise, and end. *Julianus deservit*

Christi

Christi, et Inimicus, Hereticis libertatem perditionis permisit, et tum Basilicas Hereticis reddidit, quando Tempia Dæmonij, Eo modo putans, Christianum Nomen posse perire, de Terris, si vanitati Ecclesie, de qua lapsus fuerat, invideret, et sacrilegas Dissensiones liberas esse permetteret, that is, Julian, the forsaker, and enemy of Christ, Permitted to Hereticks liberty of perdition: and at the same time restored Pallaces (or royall meeting-houses) to Hereticks, when the Temples to Divells; thinking by this meanes, the Christian Name might perish from the earth, if he should envy that unity to the Church, from which himselfe fell, and permit Sacrilegious Dissensions to enjoy their liberty.

What the Discusser subjoyned, as weakning this end, that Christianity began to be choaked, not when Christians lay in cold Prisons, but Beds of ease, and persecuted others: This doth not at all weaken the right apprehension of Julians end, For 1. Julian might asme at that end, though he might not have attained it.

Secondly, evident it is, that Toleration of bryars and thornes, (and such are Heresies and Blasphemies) doe choake the life of Christianity. For beside experience, the Text in Rev. 8. 10. 11. Declareth, that by the fall of a Starre, (called wromewood) into the waters, the third part of the waters were embittered by it, and many men dyed that drunk of those waters. And what was that Starre, but Arius and Constantine?

Thirdly, Though Beds of ease have been one meanes of choaking Christianity, yet that hindereth not, but the Toleration of all weeds to grow with the good seed, is another.

Fourthly, when he saith, Their persecuting of others was a meanes of choaking Christianity: It is a plaine contradiction of his former speech, that Constantine did more hurt to Christs Church and Kingdome, then the raging fury of the most bloudy Nervaes.

CHAP. 63. A Reply to his Chap. 66.

Discusser.

HE ends this passage with approbation of Queene Elizabeth for Persecuting the Papists, and a reproofe to King James for Persecuting the Puritans.

Defender.

Defender.

I neither did in termes approve the perſecution of the one, nor reprove the perſecution of the other. The words I ſpake of them are recited above. Chap. 38. which containe an Hiſtoricall Narration of the *Res geſta* in this caſe of both the Princes, but neither approvement, nor reprovment of them. It was enough to anſwer the Priſoners Argument, that as great Princes as the three named by him for Toleration, might be named againſt Toleration: As Queene *Elizabeth* for one, and King *James* for another, who perſecuted Puritans, though he Tolerated Papists.

Diſcuſſer.

But if Queene *Elizabeth* did well to perſecute the Papists according to her Conſcience: King *James* did not ill in perſecuting others according to his.

Defender.

It followeth not. For Queene *Elizabeth* might doe well in puniſhing ſeditious, or ſeducing Papists according to Conſcience rightly informed; and King *James* doe ill according to Conſcience miſinformed. Beſides, It may be the worſe, when a man perſecuteth thoſe, whom he knoweth to be innocent, againſt his own Conſcience. Or ſuppoſe Conſcience by often ſinning againſt the light & cheks of it, be (by the juſt Judgement of God) blinded and ſeared, In ſuch a caſe to doe a wicked act according to Conſcience, doth not extenuate, but aggravate a ſin: in that ſuch a man ſinneth not only in doing a corrupt act, but (which is worſe) with a corrupt Conſcience. But with what Conſcience King *James* did perſecute Puritans, I judge not: the judgement of ſuch things is with the Lord.

Diſcuſſer.

But then Mr. Cotton muſt graunt, that if King *James* did ill in perſecuting Puritans according to his Conſcience, then either King *James* was not fit to be King, and had not the eſſentiall qualifications of a King (in not being able rightly to judge, who are to be perſecuted, who not:) or elſe, He muſt confeſſe, that King *James*, and all Magiſtrates muſt perſecute ſuch, whom in their Conſcience they judge worthy to be perſecuted,

Defender.

None of theſe things will follow. For though King *James* did evill to perſecute godly Miniſters, and other good Chriſtians,

ans, studious of Reformation : yet he was fit to have been a King, and wanted not the essentiall Qualifications of a King. For he was by lawfull Succession the next heire of the Crowne, and was besides endued with many royall gifts of wisdom, and Knowledge, both of Scripture and Policy, which if he did not alwayes attend to, in his Administrations, the defect was not for want of Essentiall Qualifications, but for want of employing his Qualifications according to the right Rule of the word of God. For by the Rule of the word, those (whom they called) Puritans ought not to have been persecuted, no though they had been erroneous in their way, which they were not. For though they consented not to the State-Government of the Church; yet neither did they tumultuously and seditiously resist it. But suppose Princes and Magistrates doe want some Qualifications meet for their calling (as this for one, Knowledge and Judgement rightly to discern, who may be punished for matters of Religion, who not:) yet such Qualifications are not of the Essence of the calling of a King, or Magistrate, but belong onely to the Integrity of it. Yea such Kings or Magistrates as want such cleare discerning of this point, they have a just Call to forbear all execution of civill Censures in matters of Religion, till they be better informed. Or else (as the *Discusser* saith truly) they may persecute the Sonne of God in stead of the sonne of Perdition.

CHAP. 64. *A Reply to his Chap. 67.*

Discusser.

IN the second place, I aske, what glory to God, what good to the soules and bodies of their Subjects, did these Princes bring, in persecuting?

Defender.

Persecution of Innocents never brought good to Princes, or Subjects, but accidentally : as the *Discusser* said above, that Nero in persecuting, made the hearts of Christians, more sweet, and fragrant like pounded Spices. But such evill ought not to have been done, that such good in such a way might come of it.

But the good that is brought to Princes and Subjects by the
T due

due punishment of Apostate Seducers, and Idolaters, and Blasphemers, is manifold.

First, it putteth away evill from the people, and cutteth off a Gangrene, which would spread to further ungodlinesse, *Dem. 13. 5. 2 Tim. 2. 16, 17, 18.*

Secondly, it driveth away Wolves from worrying, and scattering the Sheep of Christ. For false Teachers be Wolves, (*Matth. 6. 15. Acts 20. 29.*) And the very name of Wolves holdeth forth what benefit will redound to the sheep, by either killing them, or driving them away.

Thirdly, such Executions upon such evill doers causeth all the Country to heare and feare, and doe no more such wickednesse, *Deut. 13. 11.*

Yea, as these punishments are preventions of like wickednesse in some: so are they wholsome Medicines, to heale such as are curable of these evils, *Zach. 13. 4, 5, 6.*

Fourthly, the punishments executed upon false Prophets, and seducing Teachers, doe bring downe showers of Gods blessings upon the civill State, *1 Kings 18. 40, 41.*

Fifthly, it is an honour to Gods Justice, that such Judgements are executed, *Rev. 16. 5, 6, 7.*

Discusser.

But such Executions in Queen Elizabeths dayes had rayseed almost all Europe in combustion; the warres of 88. the Spanish Invasion had speciall respect to this. And had not the Lord borne witnesse to his owne Law, and to his people herein, (by defeating the Intendments of their Enemies) it might have been the ruine, both of England and the Netherlands, which are the words of Mr. Cotton himselfe on the third Viall.

Defender.

The words Answer for themselves. The Devill and his Instruments raged against such Lawes, and such Executions, but God bare witnesse to both, by mightily defeating the Invasions and Conspiracies of Enemies.

Discusser.

It is no Argument that God bare witnesse to his people in such Deliverancies and Victories: For,

1. Events and Successes come alike to all, and are no Arguments of Love, or Hatred.

Defender.

Defender.

Events and successes are indeed no Arguments of a mans spirituall Estate, of the Love or hatred of God, to a mans person, in which sense *Solomon* speaketh, *Eccles.* 9. 1, 2. But otherwise they are ordinary witnesses, good Events of a good cause if it be well handled: ill events of an ill cause, or at least of the ill handling of a good cause, *Psal.* 1. 3, 4. *Jer.* 22. 15, 16, 17.

Discusser.

Secondly, *Papists* in their warres have ever yet had both in Peace and warre, victory and Dominion. And therefore (if successe be the measure) God hath borne witnesse to them: as in the Warres between *Charles* the first: and some *Germane Princes*, where the successe was various, between *Philip* of Spaine, and the Low-Countries; the King of France, and his Protestant Subjects, sometimes winning, sometimes loosing.

But most memorable is the History of the *Waldenses*, who fought many Battles against three succeeding Popes, with various successe: But the finall successe and Victory fell to the Popedome, and Romish Church, in the utter extirpation of those *Waldensian* witnesses.

Defender.

Reply. 1. I will not inquire of the meaning of the words, how the *Papists* in their warres have had both in Peace and Warre Victory and Dominion. But this I cannot excuse from contradiction, that the *Papists* in their Warres ever had the Victory: and yet have often fought with various successe, sometime winning, sometime loosing.

Nor can I tell, how it standeth with Truth, that *Papists* in their Warres ever had the Victory: since *Queen Elizabeth* ever had the Victory over them.

Reply. 2. Though *Papists* have fought with various Successe, it is Gods manner to nurture his people with some crosses, that they might at length learne to fight not in their owne strength, but in the Lords.

Reply. 3. The story is evident, that the *Waldenses* never lost Battell, but when they complied with the *Papists*, and trusted more in their false pretences, then in the Lord. Neither is it true, that the finall successe of the Victory fell to the Romish Church to the utter extirpation of those *Waldensian* witnesses.

For it never came to an utter Extirpation of them, but only to a disperſion into ſundry Countries of Europe, as Biſhop Uſher ſheweth in the laſt words of his Booke *De ſucceſſione Chriſtianarum Eccleſiarum*. But diſperſion is one thing; utter extirpation is another. Seed is diſperſed, and the more multiplied: but extirpation tendeth to withering, and deſtruction. Certaine it is, the *Waldenſes* long after thoſe warres, and that diſperſion, wrote Letters to *Luther*, and *Calvin*, which are extant to this day.

Diſcuſſer.

It is moſt true, what Daniel in his 8. 11. and 12. Chapters, and John Rev. 11, 12, and 13. Chapters, write of the great ſucceſſe of Antichriſt againſt Chriſt Jeſus for a time appointed.

Defender.

Not againſt Chriſt Jeſus: for who ever warred againſt him, and prevailed? *Job. 9. 4.* But true it is, againſt his ſervants *Antichriſt* prevailed for a time appointed: but it was when either the Saints ſuffered for the Truth: (and then the Saints were the true Conquerours:) or elſe when they complied with the corruptions of the times, and then though their cauſe was good, yet they handled it ill.

Diſcuſſer.

Gods ſervants are all Conquerours, when they warre with Gods weapons in Gods cauſe and worſhip: as in Rev. 2. and 3. Chapters, and in Rev. 12. they overcome the Dragon in the Romane Emperours by three weapons, the bloud of the Lamb, the word of their Teſtimony, and not loving their lives unto the death.

Defender.

It is true, thoſe are the weapons of the Miniſters of the Goſpel, and thoſe are alſo the weapons of private Chriſtians: but if the Magiſtrate be the Miniſter of God in bearing his ſword, then the Sword alſo is a weapon of God, which when it is drawne out in Gods cauſe and worſhip, according to God, with confidence, not in the arme of fleſh, but in the Lord of Hoſts, it goeth forth Conquering to conquer, *Rev. 17. 14. with Rev. 19. 14. 19, 20. Gideon's Sword, was the Sword of the Lord, Judg. 7. 20.*

CHAP. 65.

A Reply to his Chap. 68. Discussing the Testimonies alledged from Ancient and later Writers: and first, that of Hilary.

Discusser.

THe last Head of Arguments produced by the Author against persecution, was from the Judgement of Antient and later Writers: to some of which, the Answerer pleaseth to answer.

Defender.

Some of which? as if any of them were omitted? or as if all of them were not answered? compare the Prisoners Letter, and my Answer together, and see if I have balked any one of them.

Discusser.

If it be a mark of the Christian Church to be persecuted, and of the Antichristian or false Church, to persecute, then the Churches cannot be truly Christian (according to the first Institution) which either actually themselves, or by the civill Power of Kings and Princes given to them (or procured by them to fight for them) doe persecute such as dissent from them, or be opposite against them.

Defender.

I say againe, if persecution be properly taken for the punishment of the Innocent for Truth, or Righteousnesse sake, it ought not to be found in a Christian Church, but is usually found in a false and Antichristian Church, but I cannot (as the Discusser doth) make it a marke of the Christian Church, to be persecuted, and a marke of a false Church to persecute. For a Marke is such a signe as belongeth, *omni, soli, & semper*, as a marke of the Church must agree to every Church, and at all times to the Church, and onely to the Church. But to be persecuted, is not found in every true Church, at least not at all times: For after the conversion of Paul unto the Faith of Christ, the Churches had rest throughout all Judea, and Galilee, and Samaria, Acts 9. 31. shall we say they were then no true Christian Churches, because they wanted this marke of the Church, to be persecuted? Again, wee read, that after the destruction of Antichrist, the Churches of the Saints shall

shall have rest, and rule a thousand yeares, *Revel. 20. 4.* Shall their freedome from persecucion, be a dissolution of the Church-Estate? The like may be said of the *New Jerusalem* (the Churches of the *Jewes*, after the destruction of *Gog*, and *Magog*) when God shall wipe away all teares from their eyes, and take away Death (violent Death) sorrow, crying, and paine, (*Rev. 21. 4.*) shall they then cease to be Churches, when persecution ceaseth?

Beside, to persecute is not alwayes a marke of a false Church: for then it would be a marke of a false Member of a Church, or a marke of a Member of a false Church: but the contrary appeareth in the example of *Asa*, who persecuted the Prophet of God for his holy Message sake, *2 Chron. 16. 10.* And it hath been shewed above, that *Stephen* complaineth of the persecution of all the Prophets, *Acts 7. 51.* And if they were persecuted, it was by the Church of the Old Testament: and if therefore the Church of the Old Testament was false, God had then no Church extant upon the face of the Earth.

It is therefore a begging of the Question, to affirme, that those Churches cannot be truly Christian, who by themselves, or by the Civill power of Kings, doe punish such as dissent from them or are opposite against them.

And indeed a double begging of the Question, it is: For,

1. It beggeth that for the Question, which is not the Question: for it is no Question, but out of Question, that it is not lawfull for a Christian Church, to punish men for dissenting from them, or being opposite to them. But the Question is, whether Christian Magistrates may not punish Apostate Hereticks and Seducers, not for dissenting from the Church, but for seducing from Christ, and blaspheming against his Name. And (if you will) whether the Church may not stirre up the Christian Magistrate, (after all milder helps used without a vaile) to doe his Duty in such a case.

2. It is another begging of the Question, to take that for granted (*which is not yet proved*) that it is a marke of no true Christian Church to procure the civill punishment of incurable obstinate Hereticks and Seducers.

Discusser.

When the Answerer saith, that to Excommunicate an Heretick, is not to persecute.

I answer, If the Answerer were thoroughly awaked from the Spouses spirituall slumber (Cant. 5.) and had recovered from the Drunkenesse of the great Whore (who intoxicateth the Nations, Rev. 17.) It is impossible, that he should so answer.

For who questioneth, whether to excommunicate an Heretick be to persecute? Excommunication being of a spirituall nature, a sentence denounced by the word of Christ Jesus (the spirituall King of the Chureh:) and a spirituall killing by the two edged Sword of the Spirit, in delivering up the person Excommunicate unto Satan. Therefore who seeth not this Answer cometh not neere the Question?

Defender.

I must still professe my selfe to be one of them that see it not. For first the Author of the Letter did no where expresse himselfe to put any difference, neither between Church and Court, in point of censure for cause of Conscience: nor between causes of Religion, whether true, or false. If it be unlawfull to banish any from the Common-wealth for cause of Conscience, it is unlawfull to banish any from the Church for cause of Conscience. The Church ought to be more tender of the Liberty of Conscience, then the Court, as being more acquainted with the tenderesse of Conscience.

Secondly, if the censure of a man for cause of Conscience by the civill Sword, be persecution, it is a farre greater persecution to censure a man for cause of Conscience, by the Spirituall Sword, by how much the more sharp and keen the spirituall Sword is above the civill. Sure I am, Christ Jesus reckoneth Excommunication for persecution, Luke 21. 12. They shall lay their hands on you, and persecute you, delivering you up to the Synagogues, and into Prisons. To deliver up into Synagogues is as much persecution, as to deliver into Prisons. And will the Discusser then say, that if Christ had been awakened from his spirituall slumber, and from the Drunkenesse of the great Whore, it had been impossible, he should have accounted Excommunication a persecution?

Me thinks, if a soule were awakened unto spirituall sobriety, he should judge it a sorer and a deeper affliction, to be bound with spirituall chaines, both in Earth and Heaven, then to be bound in material chaines on Earth onely.

Discusser.

Discusser.

But Hilary his complaynt, speaketh not to Excommunications, but to civill censures.

Defender.

Therefore my Answer was to him partly by proportion, partly by concession. Hilary said, the Christian Church did not persecute, but is persecuted. Whereto I Answered,

1. That Excommunication of an Heretick is no persecution: and therefore by proportion neither is the civill punishment of an Heretick persecution; And the Reason in my words following reacheth both: for to persecute is to punish an Innocent: But an Heretick is not an Innocent, but a culpable and damnable person.

2. I answered by concession of Hilaryes words in Hilarys meaning, it is true, what Hilary saith, neither did the Apostles, nor may wee propogate Christian Religion by the Sword, &c.

Discusser.

But a Christian Church doth no more persecute, then a Lilly doth scratch thornes, or a Lamb pursue and teare the Wolves, or a Turke Dove doth hunt the Hawkes, or Eagles, or a chaste modest virgin fight, and scratch like Whores and Harlots.

Defender.

If by persecution, the Discusser meaneth (as it seemeth he doth) the infliction of the civill punishments, his speech is true, and the proportion holdeth, civill punishments are as improper for Christian Churches to inflict, as for Lillies to scratch Thornes, or Lambes to teare Wolves, &c.

But if the Lambes he speaketh of in his comparison, were as reasonable, as the Lambes of Christ be, though they would not themselves pursue and teare the Wolves, yet they would runne to their Shepheards (and civill Magistrates are the shepheards of all their people) to send out their dogs after the Wolves, to pursue and teare them. I see no reason, why the chaste and modest eye of a Christian Church should any more spare, and pity a spirituall Adulterer, that seeketh to withdraw her from her spouse to a false Christ, then the eye of an Holy Israelite was to spare and pitie the like Tempters in dayes of old, *Deut. 13. 8.*

CHAP. 66. A Reply to his Chap. 69.

Discusser.

THe Answer by concession to Hilary's words may further be discussed. It is true (saith the Answerer) as Hilary speaketh, that neither the Apostles, nor we, may propagate Christian Religion by the Sword: But if Pagans cannot be wonne by the word, they are not to be compelled by the Sword. Nevertheless this hindreth not, but if they or any other should blaspheme the true God, and his true Religion, they ought to be severely punished: and no lesse doe they deserve who seduce from the Truth to damnable Heresie and Idolatrie.

In which Answer, I observe, First, his Agreement with Hilary, that Christian Religion may not be propagated by the civill Sword.

Unto which I Reply, what meaneth this passage in his first Answer to the former speeches of the Kings, viz. We acknowledge, that none is to be constrained to believe or professe the true Religion, till he be convinced in Judgement of the Truth of it.

Defender.

If it be observed, my Agreement with Hilary, I then let it be observed, that the Discusser in whetting the words of the Authors of the Letter against us, layeth a false charge upon us, as if we maintained such persecution for cause of Conscience, as is condemned by the Ancient Writers. Of whom Hilary is named for one, and for the first: and yet in the Discussion it is found that we agree with him.

In that Answer to the speeches of the Kings, when I acknowledged, that none was to be constrained to beleive, or professe the true Religion, till he be convinced of the Truth of it.

I did not meane, that after he was convinced, he might then be constrained with civill censures: for neither beleiving nor professing to beleive, is to be constrained with civill censures.

But yet thus farre he may be constrained, by withholding such countenance and favour from him, such encouragement, and employment from him, as a wise and discerning Prince, would otherwise grant, to such as beleive the Truth, and professe it, so far as they are convinced of it in Judgement and Conscience. For such as will not walke according to their Light, are neither trusty servants to God, nor man.

V

Discusser.

Discusser.

That Answer to the speech of the Kings implyeth two things.

1. That the civill Magistrate, who is to constrain, must judge of all the Consciences of their Subjects, whether they be convinced or no.

2. That when the civill Magistrate discerneth that his Subjects Consciences are convinced, then he may constrain them wth & armes, violently. And accordingly, who knoweth not what constraint lyeth upon all Consciences in Old and New-England, to come to Church, and to pay Church-Duties? which is upon the point (though with a Sword of a finer gilt and trim in New-England) nothing else, but that which he confesseth, Hillary saith, should not be done, to wit, a Propagation of Religion by the Sword.

Defender.

Neither of both these things are implied in that Answer. Nor the first, (that the civill Magistrate must then Judge of all of the Consciences of their Subjects, whether they be convinced, or not) For it implyeth no more then that he is not to constrain them, till he see they be convinced. If he never see them convinced, he is to see, they be never constrained. But how far the Magistrate may discern, and judge in matters of Religion, hath been spoken above. Nor the second: For the constraint I spake of, was not by positive means, wth & armes, but negative, withholding such trust and employment from such, as he seeth are not faithfull and trusty to their God, of whose Truth they are convinced, and yet withhold it in unrighteousness. I know no constraint at all, that lieth upon the consciences of any in New-England, to come to Church: neither doe I know that any scuple lyeth upon any Conscience in New-England, that withholdeth any from hearing the word amongst us. But least of all doe I know, that any are constrained to pay Church-duties in New-England. Sure I am, none in our own Town, neither Church-members, nor other, are constrained to pay any Church-duties at all. What they pay, they give voluntarily, each one with his owne hand, without any constraint at all, but their owne will, as the Lord directeth them.

Discusser.

Again, although he confesseth, that Propagation of Religion ought not to be by the Sword; yet he maintaineth the use of the Sword, when persons (in the Judgment of the Civill State, for that is implied) shall blasphem the true God, and the true Religion, and also seduce others to damnable Heresie and Idolatry.

Defender.

Defender.

True: but this is not the Propagation of Religion but the preservation of it; on if it doe conduce to Propagation, it is onely recommended *prohibens*.

CHAR. 67. A Reply to his Chap. 70. Discussing the Testimony of Tertullian.

Discussor

TO Tertullian, the Answerer gives the like Answer: Tertullian's Intent (saith he) is onely to restraine Scapula, the Roman Governor of Africa) from persecuting the Christians, for not offering Sacrifice to their Heathen Gods: and for that end seetheth an Argument from the Law of Natural Equity, not to compell any to any Religion, but to permit them to believe, or not to believe at all.

Which we acknowledge: we judge, the English may permit the Indians to continue in their unbelief. Nevertheless, it will not therefore be lawfull to tolerate the publick worship of Devils, or Idols, in a Christian State, or the seduction of any from the Truth.

In this passage, he agreeth with Tertullian: but it is well known, that in New-England, they not onely permit the Indians to continue in their unbelief, (which they cannot help) but they also permit or tolerate them in their Paganish worship, which cannot be denyed to be a worshipping of Devils.

And therefore consequently according to the same practise, did they walke by Rule, and impartially, not on the Indians, but their Countrymen, French, Dutch, Spanisht, Perriand, Turkish, Jewes, should also be permitted in their Worship, if correspondent in civill obedience.

Defender.

It is not true, that the New-English doe tolerate the Indians (who have submitted to the English protection, and Government) in their worship of Devils openly. What the Indians doe, that are not under the English Government, the English have no warrant from God, or Law of Nations to restraine them; nor is it in the power of the English to restraine the private Worship, which some of the Indians under the English Government may possibly adhere unto to this day. What courses have been used to bring them on

to Civility, and to the knowledge of our Religion, by faire meanes, are not pertinent to the present controversie to relate. It hath been an Article of the Covenant between such *Indians* as have submitted to our Government, that they shall submit to the ten Commandements, which they thought reasonable. Some of their *Sachims* young children are brought up with us, and trained up to knowledge. Such of them as come to our Houses are fed with curtesie, and care taken often to instruct them, as farre, yea further then they are greatly willing to heare. Some of them of late, frequent our markets, to get mony, by selling Fish, Baskets, whortleberries, Cramberries, which taketh them off from some idlenesse; Some *English* are studious of the *Indian* Language, to deale with them in their owne Tongue. Of late some of our Ministers have preached to a Congregation of them, whilst others at first interpreted what was preached: but since one of our Ministers preacheth to them in their owne Language. The other day, whilst I was at the Colledge with other Elders, an *Indian* from *Plimmoist* side, (an hopefull youth) was received into some employment in the Colledge, that he might be trained up to knowledge for the help of his Country-men. But no violent course taken with them at all, to constraine them to the Faith, or Profession of Christianity. The time is hastning (we hope) when all the vials of Gods wrath will be poured out on the Antichristian State: and then we looke for the fulnesse of the *Gentiles* to come in, and with the *Jewes*, multitudes of Pagans. But till the seven plagues of the seven Angels be fulfilled, wee cannot easily hope for the entrance of a New multitudes of men into the Church according to the word of the Lord, *Rev. 15. 8.* No man (that is, no man out of the Temple, no Pagan) was able to enter into the Temple, till the seven plagues of the seven Angels were fulfilled.

But to returne to our *Discussor*, he speaketh at randome, when he intimateth, that we walke not by Rule but partially, as if we permitted not the like liberty of worship to our Country-men, nor to the French, Dutch, Spanish, Persians, Turkes, Jewes, which wee doe to the *Indians*.

For we Neither constraine them to worship God with us, nor restraine them from worshipping God in their owne way. *Persians,*

Turkes

Turkes and Jewes, come not amongst us : those of other Nations of *Europe*, when they doe come amongst us, their manner of Worship is not taken notice of amongst us. Our Country-men worship God with us for the most part, if some of them come not to our Assemblies by reason of the distance of their dwellings from us, they have Liberty of publick prayer and preaching of the word amongst themselves, by such as themselves choose, without disturbance.

Discusser.

The Answerer addeth a further Answer to Tertullian, for whereas Tertullian had said, that one main Religion doth neither hurt, nor profit another : the Answerer saith, it must be understood of private Worship, or of Religion professed in private. Otherwise a false Religion professed in publick, by the Members of the Church, or by such as have given their Names to Christ, will be the ruine and Desolazion of the Churches, Rev. 2.

Whereto I Answer, 1. Those that are Members of the Church, and those that have given their names to Christ, are all one : the distinction therefore is unsound.

Defender.

The Discusser must excuse me, though I doe not take them for all one. For men of yeares must give up their names to Christ, before they can be received Members into the Church, as is evident, *Isaiah* 56. 6, 7. Therefore they are not all one : the one precedeth the other.

Discusser.

I answer secondly, that Tertullian doth not there speake of private, but of publick worship, and Religion,

Defender.

Tertullians speech may possibly be meant of either publick or private. But as I said, to make the speech true, it must either be understood of private, or if of publick profession of Religion, it must be understood not of Christian, but of Pagan : and of Pagan during the time of Gods Patience, and their ignorance. But after God revealed the Truth of the Gospel-Religion to them, it was not safe to continue a publick Profession of Pagan-Religion : for after the White-Horse hath revealed the Gospel, a Red, and Black, and pale-horse follow, to avenge the

the rejection of it upon the Romane-Pagan-Empire, Rom. 6. 2. to 8.

Discusser.

I answer thirdly; although it be true in a Church of Christ, that a false Religion, or Worship permitted will doe hurt according to those Threats of Christ, Rev. 2. yet in many cases, I believe a false Religion will not hurt (which is most like to have been Tertullians meaning.)

1. A false Religion out of the Church will not hurt the Church: no more then weeds in the Wildernesse will hurt the inclosed Gardens: nor poyson hurt the body, when it is not touched, or taken, yea and Antidotes are received against it.

2. A false Religion and worship will not hurt a Civill State, in case the worshippers breake no civill Law. And the Answerer elsewhere acknowledgeth, that the civill Peace is not broken, where the civill Lawes are not broken. And this onely is the point in Question.

Defender.

If this onely be the point in Question, where then lyeth the controversie? for if I say (as the Discusser saith I doe) that the Civill Peace is not broken, when the Civill Law is not broken; and if a false Religion or worship doe not hurt the civill State, unlesse the Worshippers breake some civill Law, then where lyeth the pinch of the controversie?

But I would not have the Discusser mistake himselfe; I doe not remember, that I have any where said, that the civill Peace is not broken, where the civill Law is not broken. He saith, I say so elsewhere: If he meane, that I say so in the Modell drawn up by my Brethren (the Elders of those Churches) he wrongeth and polluteth himselfe much (*Crimine falsi*) when he saith that Mr. Cotton with the rest of the Ministers of New-England composed that Modell of Church and civill power. It is no new thing with him, to say I did that, which I did not: that Modell was drawen up by some other fellow Brethren, but not by me. There is a Truth in the speech which they speak, rightly understood, but not as the Discusser here taketh it.

For first, what if no civill Law be made for the establishment of Religion, nor against the violation of the Fundamentalls of it? this very defect of so needfull a Law, may bring the wrath of God upon

upon the civill State : as did the defect of a King in Israel,
Judg. 21. 25.

Againe secondly, there may be a Law made for the establishing of true Religion : and it though it be violated, yet the *Discussor* will say, no civill Law is violated, because no Law concerning the second Table is violated. But that is his mistake, to thinke the civill Lawes concerne onely the outward Estate of the People, and not their Religion.

That is a civill Law whatsoever concerneth the good of the City, and the propulsing of the contrary. Now Religion is the best good of the City : and therefore Lawes about Religion are truly called civill Lawes, enacted by civill Authority, about the best good of the City, for the promoting, and preserving of that good of the City. But having thus spoken to his second case first (*wherein he saith, a false Religion will not hurt a civill State.*)

I come now to his first : which was, that a false Religion will not hurt, if it be out of the Church, no more then weeds in the wilderness will hurt the inclosed Garden.

But what if the Garden be inclosed in the midst of a wilderness ? what if the weeds grow so neere the inclosure (or hedge) round about the Garden, that they easily creep into the Garden ? what if every blast of wind blow the seeds of the weeds into the Garden, which are ready to overspread the Garden, and to choak the good herbes ? The *Discussor* will say, they that keep and dresse the Garden should weed them out.

True, so they ought, to their best endeavour. But were it not also needfull, that the Lord of the soyle, who hath his Officers both to dresse his Garden & to keep his wilderness, should provide, that the keepers of his wilderness should suffer no venomous weeds to grow neere his garden, hedge, or pale, least the seeds thereof should annoy his Garden, and poyson those within the Garden that feed on them ?

It is true, which the *Discussor* saith, poyson will not hurt the body, unlesse it be taken, or touched, yea and Antidotes taken against it.

But who shall prevent the Members of the Church from touching or taking poyson ? or who shall provide, that all the Members shall take the Antidotes which are prepared for them ? Here will be needfull the faithfull vigilancy of the Christian Magistrate,

to assist the Officers of the Church in the Lords worke: the one to lay in Antidotes to prevent infection: the other to weed out infectious noysome weedes, which the sheep of Christ will be touching and taking, when they will sometime neglect their Antidotes. It is a very unlikely thing which the Discusser saith (it is most likely) that Tertullian meant one of these two cases.

For doubtlesse his meaning was, to plead for the Innocency and impunity of his owne Religion, which was indeed the Truth of God. And he might safely plead, that if the Pagan Religion did not hurt their civill Government, (as the Romane Governours doubted not of that) he biddeth them to be secure of the Christian Religion, it will never hurt them at all. When therefore he speakes of Religion indefinitely, that one mans Religion will not hurt another, it is *Argumentum ad hominem*, let not Scapula suspect hurt from Christian Religion to the Romane State. If the Romane Religion be the preservation of the Romane Empire (as Scapula thought) Christian Religion (though tolerated, yea though received, and advanced) will never be their destruction, nor disturbance.

CHAP. 68. A Reply to his Chap. 71. Discussing the Testimony of Ierome.

Discusser.

Ierome (saith the Answerer) confesseth not the Truth, nor advanceth your cause: for we graunt, what he saith, That Heresie must be cut off by the Sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God. But this hindereth not, but that being so cut downe, if the Hereticke doe still persist in his Heresie to the seduction of others, he may be cut off also by the civill Sword, to prevent the perdition of others.

And that to be Jeromes meaning, appeareth by his Note upon that of the Apostle (Gal. 5.) A little Leaven leaveneth the whole lump. Therefore saith he, a sparke, as soone as it appeareth, is to be extinguished, and the Leaven to be removed from the rest of the dough: Rotten pieces of flesh are to be cut off, and a scabbed Beast is to be driven from the sheepfold: least the whole house, body, masse of dough, and Flock, be set on fire with the sparke, be putrified with the rotten flesh, sowed with the Leaven, perishe with the scabbed Beast.

But

But to this I Answer, 1. He granteth to Tertullian, that Here-
 sic must be cut off with the Sword of the Spirit: yet withall he main-
 taineth a cutting off by the second Sword, the Sword of the Magistrate,
 and conceiveth that Tertullian, so meaneth, because he quoteth that of
 the Apostle, a little Leaven leaveneth the whole lump.

Ans. 2. It is no Argument to prove that Tertullian meant a civill
 Sword, by alledging, 1 Cor. 5. or Gal. 5. which properly and onely ap-
 prove a cutting off by the Sword of the Spirit, and purging out of leaven
 in the Church.

And if Tertullian should so meane, as the Answerer doth: yet 1.
 The cutting off of Herefic by the Sword of the Spirit implyeth an abso-
 lute sufficiency in the Sword of the Spirit to cut it downe, according to
 1 Cor. 10. 4.

2. It is cleare to be the meaning of the holy Spirit and of the Apostle
 in the words alledged by him, a little Leaven &c.

Defender.

Reply 1. This Testimony of Jerome, which the Authour of the
 Letter alledgeth against persecution for Conscience, I might just-
 ly refuse to spend time about it, till either the Author or the
 Discussor doe make it appeare to be the words of Jerome. For
 though I at first gave Answer to it, as presuming the Letter had
 not forged it: yet now looking into the place of Jerome, whence
 it is quoted, I finde no such matter. The Letter quoteth
 it out of Hieronims Proeme upon the fourth Booke of his Com-
 mentaries upon Jeremy. But perusing the place, I finde no such
 words, neither in that Proeme on his fourth Booke on Jeremy,
 nor in any other Proeme of any other of his Bookes on Jeremy
 which are six in all.

Reply. 2. I might here observe, (if I should deale with him,
 as he doth with me, in his Chap. 38) the like failings in the Dis-
 cussor, in putting Tertullian foure times in this passage instead of
 Jerome, whom he hath in hand. When I had once named Titus
 for Timothy, he observeth the hast, and light attention, and sleepinesse
 of the Answerer. But I will not make such an observation upon
 his misnaming of an Author, which might easily slip from his pen,
 or from his Scribe, or from the error of the Printer.

Reply 3. In this he doth me wrong, to put upon me that for a
 Reason, which hath no reason in it, to wit, that I should conceive,

that *Te nullum* (*Ierome*, he would say) meaneth a civill Sword because he quoteth that of the Apostle, a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump.

For I gather it, not from his quotation of those words of the Apostle (which I easily graunt, doe clearly speake of Church-censure, not of civill censure :) But I gather it partly from his exposition of the parallell words in the same Chapter : and partly from the words he useth in opening that very Text. The parallell place in the same Chap. is ver. 12. *I would* (saith the Apostle) *they were cut off that trouble you.* This cutting off, (or ἀποκοπή) He expoundeth the cutting off of their virility which no man will say is a Church-Censure. I spake not here of the true meaning of the Text (which doubtlesse, speaketh of a Church-Censure) but of the true meaning of *Ieromes* words.

Againe, when *Ierome* would have the spark, as soone as it appeareth, to be extinguished, and the leaven to be removed from the rest of the Dough &c. though it be true (which the Discusser speaketh) that the Apostle intendeth a Church-Censure : yet doubtlesse *Ierome* aymed at more in those comparisons, even to a civill censure also. For to these comparisons, he immediately subjoyneth these words, *Arius in Alexandria una scintilla fuit : sed quia non statim oppressa est, totum orbem, eius flamma depopulata est.* *Arius* (saith he) was but one sparkle : yet because he was not speedily executed (or suppressed) his flame depopulated all the world. Where by the extinguishing of that spark, he doth not meane, by excommunication : for he was not ignorant, that *Arius* had been speedily excommunicate, once and againe out of the Church of *Alexandria* ; once whilst he was Deacon, as *Sozomene* reporteth in *Lib. 1. Ecclesiast Historie, Chap. 14.* And though afterwards, he got into the Church againe, yet he was againe excommunicated, when he was *Presbyter*, and cast out of his *Presbytery*, as *Socrates* reporteth in his *lib. 1. Ecclesiast Historie, Cap. 6.* of the Greek Edition ; Chap. 3. of the latine. So that *Hierome* complaining, of the great hurt, which the sparke of *Arius* did, because he was not timely put out, he did not meane, of putting out of the Church (which was done timely enough, and twice for failing) but because he was not put out either out of the world, or at least, out of the Confines of Neighbour Churches.

Say not: yet *Paul* doubtlesse spake of putting out of the Church. For though that be true: yet now the Question is not of *Pauls* judgement in this place, but of *Hieromes* judgement, which the Author of the Letter alledgeth as a witnesse for himselfe, and the Discusser would maintaine it: though *Ieromes* words will not beare it. It argueth, men are more led by will, then judgement to uphold a cause, when the witnesses which themselves produce, beare witnesse against them. Neither let any man say, That this graunt of his, *That Heresie must be cut off with the Sword of the spirit,* doth imply an absolute sufficiency in the Sword of the Spirit to cut it downe, according to 2 Cor 10. 4, 5.

For though Spirituall weapons be absolutely sufficient to the end for which God hath appointed them (as hath been opened above) to wit, for the conviction, and (if he belong to God) for the conversion of the offender, for the mortifying of his flesh, & for the saving of his soule, and for the cleansing of the Church from the fellowship of that guilt: yet if an Hereticke still continue obstinate, and persist in seducing, creepe into Houses, lead captive silly soules, and destroy the faith of some, (it may be, of many) such Gangrenes would be cut off by another Sword, which in the hand of the Magistrate is not borne in vaine.

Discusser.

But the eye of this Answerer could never be so obscured, as to run to a Smiths shop, for a Sword of Iron, and Steele, to help the Sword of the Spirit, if the Sunne of righteousness had once been pleased to shew him; That a Nationall Church (which elswhere he professeth against) a State Church, (whether explicate, as in Old England, or implicate, as in New) is not the Institution of the Lord Jesus Christ. The Nationall Typicall State Church of the Jewes, necessarily called for such weapons: But the particular Churches of Christ in all parts of the world, consisting of Jewes and Gentiles, is powerfully able to defend it selfe, and offend men, and Divells, although the State and Kingdom (wherein the Churches be) had neither carnall Sword, nor Speare, as once it was in the Nationall Church in the Land of Canaan; 1 Sam. 13.

Defender.

I should think mine eye were very obscure indeed, if I should run to a Smiths shop to fetch the Authority of the civill Magistrate from thence: or if I should thinke his Authority could not

be put forth against all evill doers (and amongst others, against Hereticks) without a Sword of Iron or Steele. If their be stones in the streets, the Magistrate need not fetch a Sword from the Smiths shop, nor an Halter from the Ropers, to punish an Heretick. A pleasant wit can play with a feather of every flying Faw-cy, and yet (which is to be lamented) bring in such light conceits into grave Discourses, and Disputes about the holy things of God.

But two things let the Discusser understand, 1. That the Lord (through his grace) hath opened mine eye many a yeare agoe, to discern, that a Nationall Church is not the Institution of the Lord Jesus. And himselfe confesseth, that elsewhere I have profest against such a Church State: nor will he ever be able to make it good, that the Church in *New-England* is implicicely any Nationall, or State-Church.

2. Let him understand further, that I should thinke mine eye not onely obscured, but the sight of it utterly put out; if I should conceive, as he doth, That the Nationall Church State of the *Jewes* did necessarily call for such weapons to punish Hereticks, more then the Congregationall State of particular Churches doth call for the same, now in the dayes of the New-Testament. For was not the Nationall Church of the *Jewes* as compleately furnished with spirituall Armour to defend it selfe, and to offend men: and Divells, as the particular Churches of the New-Testament be? Had they not power to convince false Prophets, as *Elijah* did the Prophets of *Baal*? Had they not power to seperate all evil doers from the fellowship of the Congregation? what power have our particular Churches now, which their Nationall Church wanted? or what efficacy is their found in the exercise of our power which was wanting to them?

If it be said, Their Nation was an holy Nation, and an uncleane person might not live amongst them:

Ans. It is true, he might not enter into the Congregation with the rest of the *Israelites*, to worship the Lord: but he was permitted to live in the Common-wealth of *Israel*, men uncircumcised both in heart, and flesh.

It is therefore a Sophistical imagination of mans Braine, to make a mans selfe, or the world believe, that the Nationall Church-State of the *Jewes*, required a civill Sword, whereas the particular

cular Church-State of the Gospel needs no such help.

Why not I pray you? Because particular Churches are powerfully able, by the Sword of the Spirit, to defend themselves, and to offend men, or Divells?

And was not the Nationall Church of *Israel* as powerfully able, by the same Spirit to doe the same? Surely it was both spoken and meant of the Nationall Church of the *Jewes*, Not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord of Hostes? *Zaeb. 4. 6.* And doth not the Discusser himsele observe, that time was in the Nationall Church of the Land of *Canaan*, when there was neither carnall Speare, nor Sword to be found? *1 Sam. 13.* And was not then the Nationall Church powerfully able (by the Spirit of God) to defend it selfe, and to offend men, and Divells, as well as particular Churches now?

CHAP. 69. A Reply to his Chap. 72.
discussing the Testimony of Brentius.

Discusser.

Brentius upon *1 Cor. 3.* saith, no man hath power to make or give Lawes to Christians, whereby to binde their Consciences. For willingly, freely, and uncompelled, with a ready desire, and chearfull minde, must those that come, run unto Christ.

To this the Answerer returneth, Brentius (saith he) speaketh not to your cause. Wee willingly graunt you, that man hath no power to binde Conscience: but this hindereth not, that men may see the Lawes of God observed, which doe binde Conscience.

But the graunting this, That men have no power to make Lawes to binde Conscience, overthroweth such his Tenent, and practise as restraine men from their worship, according to their Conscience, and beleife, and constraineth them to such worships, which their own soules tell them, they have no satisfaction, nor faith in.

1. It is an untruth, that either we restraine men from worship according to Conscience, or constraineth them to worship against Conscience: or that such is my Tenent and practise.

2. Though it were true that wee did both: yet this did not make

make Lawes to binde Conscience, but the outward man onely: nor would we thinke it meer, to binde the outward man against Conscience.

Discusser.

Aguine, whereas the Answerer affirmeth, That men may make Lawes to see the Lawes of God observed.

1 Answer, As God needs not the help of a materiall Sword of Steele to assist the Sword of the Spirit in the affairs of Conscience: so those men, those Magistrates, yea that Common-wealth which makes such Magistrates must needs have power and Authority from Christ Iesus to sit Iudge, and to determine in all the great Controversies concerning Doctrine, Worship, Government &c.

Defender.

God needeth not the help of a materiall Sword of Steele, to assist the Sword of his Spirit of righteousness in the duties of the second Table, no more then to assist the Sword of the Spirit of holynesse in the duties of the first Table. The Law of Righteousnesse is as fully and plainly written by the Spirit of God in the hearts and Consciences of men, as is the Law of holynesse: yea and more too. And yet the Discusser doth not (for ought I know) make it a needlesse matter for God to accept the helpe of the materiall Sword to assist the Spirie of Righteousnesse in the affaires of Conscience, which pertaineth to the second Table. The truth is, God needeth not the Arme of flesh to help him, that is, he needeth not any help, which the wisdom or strength of the creature can invent, or bring forth, which himselfe appointed not. But yet God thinks it no dishonour to himselfe, to make use of his owne Ordinances, in their owne bounds, to his owne ends; Nor doeth he then need them, when he useth them, but wee need such helps for the performance of our duty both to God, and man. Which made it a cursed sin in Meroz, not to come out to help the Lord, *Judge. 5. 23.*

Nor will it hence follow, that such Magistrates as are chosen to help forward the work of God in matters of Religion, hat either themselves, or the Common-wealth that chooseth them, must needs have power, and Authority from Christ, to sit Iudge, and to determine in all great controversies of Religion, in Doctrine, Discipline and Government:

It is enough that they are called of God to be wise and learned in the service of Christ, and in the wayes of his Kingdome. *Psal.* 2. 10, 11, 12. which if they have learned, they ought to rule with him, and for him: or else how shall it be fulfilled, which is written of them, The Kingdomes of the world, are become the Kingdomes of the Lord, and of his Christ, and he shall reigne for ever? *Rev.* 7. 15. Yea in this case, it is learning enough, if they know the Principles and Foundations of Religion, and can discern the Arrogancy of a tumultuous spirit after conviction For such want not judgement; to censure Apostacy, to Heresie in doctrine, to Idolatry in worship, to Tyranny in Government.

Discusser

But then I aske, whether upon this ground, it must not evidently follow, that then either there is no Common-wealth, nor Civill State of men in the world, that is not qualified with this discerning: (and then the Common-wealth hath more light concerning the Church, then the Church it selfe :) Or that the Common-wealth and Magistrates thereof must judge and punish as they are perswaded in their owne beleife and Conscience (be their Conscience, Paganish, Turkish, or Antichristian :) And what is this, but to confound Heaven and Earth together? and to take away not onely the being of Christianity out of the world, but all civility, yea the world out of the world, and to lay all upon heaps of confusion?

Defender.

See what strange effects, a strong fancy can produce? would you not think, it must be some strange, and strong paradox, that if it be graunted shall produce such strange and strong effects, as to take away the being of Christianity out of the world, yea and all civility, yea and the world out of the world?

But when men have slept a while, and strong fancies are evaporated, the world will stand where it is, and civility stand in the world, and Christianity in civility.

I say therefore (that which no sober minde can contradict) that though Magistrates be bound to become wise and learned, to know Christ, and to establish the Religion of Christ, yet it will not (as the Discusser saith) evidently follow, no nor follow at all, *That then there is no lawfull Commonwealth nor Civill State of men in the world, which is not qualified with this spirituall discerning.*

For

For though it be the duty of Civill States, thus to be qualified: yet their want of such qualifications, doth not make them unlawfull States. Many due qualifications are required in Husbands, Wives, Children, Servants, Magistrates, Churches, the want of which maketh them defective, and sinfull, but doth not make them unlawfull. This will need no prooffe to any sober minde.

Muchlesse will it follow upon the former Premises, that the very Common-wealth hath then more light concerning the Church of Christ, then the Church it selfe.

For it is a weake Church, that knowes no more light, then Principles: And what light the Common-wealth hath, it may have received from the Church. Howsoever, the Magistrates power to establish the Religion of Christ doth no way inferre, That he that establisheth that Religion, which is professed in the Church, hath more light concerning that Religion, or any part of it, then the Church it selfe. Albeit, it is not impossible, nor is it absurd that sometime the Magistrate may have more light in matters of Religion, then the Church it selfe. David (for ought wee read) was the first that discerned the disorder in Carting the Arke of God, 1 Chron. 15. 2. And Hezekiah was the first, that prevented the Priests and Levites, and the whole Church, in the worke of Reformation, from the Apostacy of Ahaz, 2 Chron. 29. 4, to 11.

But there is no colour of consequence, that because Magistrates are bound to discerne, and know the will of Christ, and to serve him with their power, That therefore such as have no discerning of Christ, nor of his holy will, That they should punish and destroy Christ, and Christians, and seeke only to advance their owne Religion, which is but Idolatry and Superstition.

C H A P. 70.

A Reply to his Chap. 73. Discussing the Testimony of Luther.

Discusser.

Luthers Testimony, saith the Answerer, reacheth to two things, neither of which we deny.

First, that the Government of the civill Magistrate reacheth no further, then to the bodies and goods of their Subjects, not over their soules: and therefore they may not undertake to give Lawes to the soules and Consciences of men.

Secondly, that the Church of Christ doth not use the Arme of secular power, to compell men to the true profession of the Truth. For this is to be done with spirituall weapons, whereby Christians are to be exhorted, and compelled.

But this (saith he) hindereth not, That Christians sinning against the Light of Faith, and Conscience, may justly be censured of the Church, by Excommunication, and of the civill Magistrate also, in case they shall corrupt others to the perdition of their soules.

This Joynt-confession of the Answerer with Luther (to wit, that the Government of the civill Magistrate extendeth no further then over the bodies and goods of their Subjects, not over their soules) who seeth not, that hereby is given a cleare Testimony, that either the spirituall and Church Estate, the preaching of the word, Baptisme, Ministry, Government thereof, belongeth to the civill body of the Common-wealth, (that is, to the bodies and goods of men, which seemeth monstrous to Imagine:) or else, that the civill Magistrate cannot (without exceeding the bounds of his Office) meddle with those spirituall Affaires.

Defender.

A man that is willing to open his eyes, may easily see, that though the Government of the civill Magistrate doe extend no further then over the bodies and goods of his Subjects, yet he may and ought to improve that power over their bodies and goods, to the good of their soules: yea and by promoting the good of their soules, he may much advance the good of their

outward

outward man also. The bodies, and goods, and outward Estates of men may expect a blessing, when their soules prosper. Though God may keep his Saints low in outward Estate, that grow fastest in Godlinesse: yet sure Godlinesse hath the Promises of this life, and of a better, 1 Tim. 4. 8. And such as first seeke the Kingdome of God, may expect all these outward things to be cast in upon them. If it seeme a monstrous thing in the eyes of the *Discusser*, to imagine, that the good Estate of the Church, and the well-ordering of the Ordinances of God therein, should concerne the civill good of the Common-wealth, it may well seeme monstrous to him, to imagine that the flourishing of Religion is the flourishing of the civill State, and the decay of Religion is the decay and ruine of the civill State. But such Virgine soules, as follow the Lamb, wheresoever he goeth (*Rev. 14. 4.*) would be loath to goe to live in such a Common-wealth, to whom it should seeme monstrous, that the things of God should belong to them.

And therefore the Magistrate need not to feare, that he should exceed the bounds of his Office, if he should meddle with the spirituall affaires of the Church in Gods way. It is true, if he shall meddle with the execution of a Ministers Office, as *Uzziah* did: or if he shall set up humane Inventions in Doctrine, Worship, Government, in stead of Christs Institutions, as *David* brought the Arke of God upon Oxen, instead of the shoulders of the Levites: Or if he shall thrust in *Jeroboams* Priests upon the Church, and cast out faithfull Ministers: or if he shall make Lawes to bind Conscience, in all these, or any such Like, he exceedeth the bounds of his Office. But if he shall diligently seeke after the Lord, and read in the word of the Lord all the dayes of his life (*Deut. 17. 19.*) that he may both live as a Christian, and rule as a Christian, if he shall seeke to establish and advance the Kingdome of Christ more then his owne: If he shall encourage the good in a Christian course, and discourage such as have evill will to *Sion*: and punish none for matter of Religion, but such as subvert the Principles of saving Truth (which no good Christian, much lesse good Magistrate can be ignorant of) or at least such as disturbe the Order of the Gospel in a turbulent way, verily the Lord will build up and establish the House and Kingdome of such Princes, as doe thus build up his.

Discusser.

Discusser.

Againe necessarily it must follow that these two are contradictory to themselves (which yet both of them are Mr. Cottons Positions) the Magistrates Power extends no further then to the bodies and goods of the Subject: and yet

The Magistrate must punish Christians for sinning against the Light of Faith and Conscience, and for corrupting the soules of men.

Defender.

If the Christian Faith, and a good Conscience be a part, and a great part, a chiefe part of the good of Christians, then these two are so farre from contradicting one another, that they establish one another. For if a Magistrates power extend to the preserving of the Goods of the Subject, and to the punishment of the Impachers or purloyners thereof; then he falleth short of his duty, if he suffer their Faith and good Conscience to be corrupted or dispoyled without revenge. Againe, this I say further (which also will easily avoide appearance of Contradiction) suppose by Goods were meant onely outward Goods, and that the Magistrates power extended no further then the bodies and goods of the Subjects: yet though he have no power over Faith and Conscience, he hath neverthelesse lawfull power to punish such evill doers in their Bodies and goods, as doe seduce his people to make shipwrack of Faith, and a good Conscience. For in seeking Gods Kingdome and Righteousnesse, men prosper in their outward Estates, *Matth. 6. 33.* otherwayes they decay. Besides, I doe not remember, that this Proposition is any of mine (which yet the Discusser fastneth upon me) that the Magistrates power extendeth no further then the bodies and Goods of his Subjects.

I doe not deny the Truth of it, rightly understood, but it seemeth to me somewhat too loose, and confused, for me to owne it as mine own. For the Magistrates power may be said to extend no further then the bodies and Goods of his Subjects, either as the Subject of his power, or as the end of his power. If Goods be meant outward Goods, and the Magistrates power be said to extend no further then to the body and Goods of his Subjects, as to the Object of his power, the Proposition is true. But if it be meant of the end of his power, as if a Magistrates power reached no further then to the preservation of their bodies and outward Goods,

it is false For the Adequate end of the Magistrates power, is *in Nostrum, bene administrare Rempublicam*, well to governe the Common-wealth. Now can it be well with a Common-wealth, that liveth in bodily health, and worldly wealth, but yet without Church, without Christ, without God in the world? But though God for a time may preserve a civill State in health and wealth, through his Patience, and bounty, especially till meanes of Grace be offered to them: yet after meanes of Grace be offered, they cannot long expect bodily health, or wealth to be continued to them, if they neglect, or despise, or depart from so great salvation. Witnesse the Romane Empire, which though it abounded in worldly blessings, till the Lord Jesus came riding forth amongst them upon a White Horse of the Gospel of his Grace: yet after they neglected so great Salvation, then followed a Red Horse of Warre, and a black Horse of Famine, and a Pale Horse of Pestilence and other Judgements, which much impeached both the health, and wealth of that State, and would have ruined it, had it not cast away her Idolls, and advanced the Scepter of the Lord Jesus.

Now the God of all Grace be pleased at length to shake the heart of this *Discusser*, that he may not thus delight to seduce himselfe and others against the Light of Grace, and Conscience, against Reason and Experience. *Discusser.*

Againe, in the Answerers Joynt-confession with Luther, that the Church doth not use the secular power to compell men to the Faith, and Profession of the Truth, he condemneth (as before I have observed.)

1. His former implication, that they may be compelled, when they are convinced of the Truth of it.

Defender.

This implication where it was formerly observed, it hath been formerly cleared from implication of Contradiction. I have never said, that after men be convinced of the Truth; they may be compelled to the Profession of it, by any penalties, but onely by withdrawing such favours as are not comely or safe for faithlesse persons. *Discusser.*

2. He condemneth their owne Practise, who suffer no man of any different Conscience and worship to live in their Jurisdiction, unlesse he depart from the Exercise of his owne Religion, and worship, differing from

from that allowed of in their civill Estate, yea and also actually submit to come to their Church. Defender.

This charge of the *Discusser*, let him consider, if it be not contradictory to his owne Relation, chap. 60. where he saith, wee permit and tolerate the Indians in their Paganish worship, which wee might restraine. Yet here he saith, we suffer no man of any different Conscience, or worship to live in our Jurisdiction.

Neither is it true, that we suffer no man of any different Conscience or worship to live in our Jurisdiction. For not to speake of *Presbyterians*, who doe not onely live amongst us, but exercise their publick Ministry without disturbance, there be *Anabaptists*, and *Antinomians* tolerated to live not onely in our Jurisdictions, but even in some of our Churches. Yea saith the *Discusser*, but they must actually submit to come to our Church.

I cannot say, nor doe I beleive, that any man is compelled to come to our Church, against his Conscience. Nay we are so farre from that, (and that the *Discusser* is not ignorant of) that our Churches doe not exhortate with our Members who heare in England, no not then, when there was more difference from us in manner of worship, then (through the mercy of God) now there is. The which the *Discusser* himselfe hath declared to have been no little Offence unto himselfe. Which maketh me the more to marvel, that he should now charge it upon us, that we compell all to come to heare in our Churches, against their Consciences: when he is wont to be offended, that we suffer them to heare in any true Church (though polluted) according to their Consciences.

Discusser.

Howsoever they cover the matter with this varnish, that none are compelled farther unto their Churches, then unto the hearing of the word, unto which all men are bound: yet it will appeare, that Teaching, and being taught in a Church-Estate is a Church-worship, as true and proper a Church-worship, as is the Supper of the Lord, Acts 2. 46.

I cannot call to mind, that either upon that colour, or any other, any man in this Country was ever compelled to heare the word of God, in any of our Churches, in this Country. But there is indeed some colour for the varnish he speaketh of: but not that which he pretendeth (our compulsion of any man for to heare:) but a controversy with himselfe upon another occasion, as I remember.

The

The *Discusser* sometimes endeavoured to draw away the Church of *Salem* (whereof he was sometime Teacher) from holding Communion with all the Churches in the Bay, because wee tolerated our Members to heare the word in the Parishes of *England*. Wee to satisfie him in that, held forth (that which here he calleth a varnish) that hearing was a common Duty lying upon all men, where the word of God was truly taught. He replied, as he doth now, that Teaching and hearing in a Church-Estate is Church worship, *Acts* 2. 46. To which we gave Answer (as now againe) That though Teaching and being taught in a Church-Estate be Church-worship (according to *Acts* 2. 46.) yet it is not a Church-worship, but to such as are in a Church-Estate. To all it is an holy Ordinance of Gods worship, and a Christian Duty. And though Teaching and hearing doth imply a Relation, yet not a Church-relation. There is a relation between a Teacher, and a Learner, in any Art, or Knowledge: and there may be a nearer relation between a Preacher and an Hearer, in case the Hearer be begotten to God by such a Sermon (even the same relation as is between a spirituall Father, and Sonne) but this doth not amount to Church-relation, and Communion, till there passe some mutuall profession of Covenant (explicit or implicit) between them. A Pagan Infidell may come into a Christian Church-Assembly to heare the word, and may be convinced and converted by it, (as suppose he in *Corinth*, 1 *Corinthians* 14. 24, 25.) yet is he not therefore joyned in Church-Estate, and Fellowship with them, without profession of acknowledgement, and acceptance.

Discusser.

Secondly, all persons (Papists, and Protestants) that are Conscientious have alwayes suffered upon this ground especially, that they have refused to come to each others Church, or meeting.

Defender.

It is too large an Hyperbole, to affirme, that all persons that are Conscientious (whether Papist, or Protestant,) have alwayes suffered upon this ground. Are no men conscientious but such as have suffered upon this ground? are there not many that were never put upon this Tryall? and are not many conscientious, that never scrupled this point? and are there not many conscientious, that

that have suffered upon other points, that never suffered upon this point?

Besides though many conscientious Protestants and Papists doe refuse to heare in each others Assembly, or Church, it is not because such hearing doth implant them into their Church-State: but out of feare to be leavened with their corrupt Doctrine, or polluted with some other part of false worship.

CHAP. 71.

A Reply to his Chap. 74. Touching the Testimony of the Papists against Persecution.

Discusser.

AS for the Testimony of the Popish Booke (saith the Answerer) wee weigh it not: as knowing what ever they speake for toleration of Religion; where themselves are under Hatches: yet when themselves come to sit at Sterne, they Judge and practise quite contrary: as both their writings, and judicall proceedings have testified to the world these many yeares.

But (for Answer to him) though both their writings and practises have been such: yet the Scriptures, and expressions of Truth alledged by them, doe speake loudly and fully for them; that where they are under the Hatches they should not be smothered, but suffered to breath and walk upon the Decks in the aire of civill Liberty.

Defender.

Reply. 1. When the Author of the Letter calleth that Popish Booke (out of which he quoteth that Testimony) a wicked Booke, why may not that Testimony be a wicked Testimony, (as by his owne Judgement) the Booke, a wicked Booke?

Reply. 2. It is true, which they say, the meanes which Almighty God appointed for the conversion of Kingdomes, was Humility, Patience and Charity: neither doe wee allow any meanes of rigour for Conversion of soules, but onely the power of Spirituall Armour.

It is true also which they alledge out of *Matth. 10. 16.* That Christ sent his Apostles as sheep into the midst of Wolves: He did not send

send Wolves amongst sheep, to kill, imprison, spoyle, &c. But this onely sheweth, what the condition and Commission, and worke of Ministers is, when they are sent among Pagans, and Persecutors. But this is no prohibition to Ministers, when they live in a Church of Christ, to drive away Wolves from the Sheepfolds of Christ, as knowing they come to kill and to destroy. And drive them away they may, not onely by Church-censures, if they be of the Church (*Tit. 3. 10, 11.*) but also if they be out of the Church, by miraculous vengeance, (in case they have such a gift, as *Paul* had, and used it against *Elymas*, *Acts 13. 9, 10, 11.*) or by their Prayers, (though the *Discusser* deny it, *chap. 27.* as *Paul* did against *Alexander*, *2 Tim. 4. 14.* or by stirring up the civill power against them, as *Elijah* did *Abab* and the people, against the Prophets of *Baal*, *1 Kings 18. 40.*

Reply. 3. That which they alledge out of *Matth. 10. 7.* (they meane *17.*) is as farre wide from the purpose, as the former. It is true, the Apostles ought not to deliver the People (whom they are sent to convert) unto Councels, or Prisons, or to make their Religion Felony, or Treason.

But what is this to such as being converted to the Profession of the Faith, doe Apostate from the Faith, and seeke to subvert the Faith, which they have professed? Or what is this to such, as doe seeke also to subvert the civill State, to kill Kings, or dethrone them, and to dispose of their Kingdomes? may not such (Religion shall I say, or Rebellion:) be made Felony or Treason? But see here the partiality both of the Letter, and of the *Discusser*: if a Christian King set not up the Popish Religion, but make Lawes for the establishment of the Truth, this shall be condemned in him as Hereticall pravity, himselfe prescribed, dethroned, killed, and his Kingdome alienated to a stranger. And this shall passe with Toleration. But if a Prince shall make Lawes for the security of himselfe and his Kingdome, and condemne such seditious, and rebellious Attempts for Felony and Treason, this shall be taxed as unchristian Persecution, and contrary to the way of Christ, and his Apostles.

Reply. 4. It is true likewise, what they quote out of *verse 32.* When ye enter into an House Christ had them salute it, saying, Peace be to the House; he doth not say, send Pursevants, to ransack and spoile it.

For

For Christ sent not his Apostles with civill power: nor doth he allow Princes, to send Pursevants to ransack Houses, that so they might convert the Housholders, or sojourners therein. But if Seducers to Idolatry be found there, and Rebels, and Conspirators against the civill State be found there, though that Commission to the Apostles speake not to such case: yet it is enough, the Magistrates Commission from God, *Rom. 13. 4.* Armeth him to take vengeance on evill doers.

Reply. 5. To *John, 10. verse 10, 11.* The Answer is as easie as to the former. *The Pastor giveth his Life for the sheep: he cometh not to kill, or to destroy the sheep. But what if he see the Wolfe coming? or what if he see the Thiefe coming? both of them, to steale, and kill, and to destroy? Shall the Pastor now sit still, and not hazard his life in their defence, contrary to verse 11, 12, 13? Or shall he betake himselfe onely to spirituall censures, when it may be they are not capable of such stroakes? Or shall it be an hainous and unchristian carriage in him, to seeke ayde against such Thieves and Wolves from them who should see that the sheep of Christ may lead a quiet, and peaceable Life in all Godlinesse and Honesty? 1 Tim. 2. 1, 2.* The Apostles themselves, and the Churches planted by them, they doe not so much as desire it of God from their Magistrates, that they may live a quiet and peaceable life in a way of ungodlinesse, no more then a way of dishonesty. So *Paul* himselfe professeth, *Acts 25. 8. 11.* But in a way of Godlinesse and Honesty, they desire of God, they may find by the protection of their Magistrates, a quiet and peaceable life, in that Text of *Timothy*.

Thus to satisfie the *Discussers* mind, and to prevent any pretence of exception, I have runne over the Scriptures, and expressions of Truth alledged in the Popish Booke, which he saith, *speake loudly, and fully for their Toleration: but how truly, let the servants of God judge.*

Discussor.

But Protestants herein shew themselves partiall, and practise that themselves which they taxe in Papists. For though they cry out of Persecution when themselves are under Hatches, yet when they come to sit at Helme, they runne the same course both in Doctrine and Practise.

When Mr. Cotton and others have formerly been under Hatches,

what sad and true complaints have they poured out against Persecution? But coming to the Helme, how doe they themselves both by Preaching, Writing, Printing, practise unnaturally, and partially expresse towards other, the cruell Nature of such Lyons, and Leopards, as some of them have opened out of Cant. 4. 8.

Defender.

What we have opened out of Cant. 4. 8. against Persecution, when (as he saith) wee were under the Hatches, amounted to this, That it was lawfull for the sheep of Christ, to follow Christ, and and to come along with him, and flye away from persecution. Did any of us then teach, that it was unlawfull for Magistrates to pursue with just revenge Apostate Seducers unto Idolatry, Heresie, or blasphemy? or turbulent subverters of civill or Church-Order? And since we are come hither, where he is pleased to honour us with sitting at Helme (which is farre from us) what have we taught or practised more, then our selves allowed in times of our owne restraint? But men that can allow themselves a Liberty of calumny, it may well become them to plead for a Liberty of impunity for all Religions.

We keep not a weight and a weight (as he calumniateth) a measure and a measure: what we measure out to others, wee should never thinke it hard measure to have the same returned to our selves in the like case, Onely this measure we desire of all hands to be kept (that which Abraham the Father of the faithfull, and God the Judge of all the Earth, thought equall, Gen. 18. 25.) that the Righteous should not be as the wicked: nor that Truth, and Fidelity, should suffer as Heresie and Apostacy.

Discusser.

Yea, but it is not confidence of being in the Truth (which they judge the Papists and others are not in) no nor the Truth it selfe that can privilege them to persecute others, and so exempt themselves from persecution, for three Considerations.

First, because it is against the nature of true sheep, to persecute, or hunt the Beasts of the Forrest, no not the Wolves, who have persecuted themselves.

Defender.

It is a feeble kind of reasoning, from a similitude in some things, to presse a resemblance in every thing: Sheep doe fitly resemble Christians in many proprieties: but he that shall therefore presse them

them to be like in all, shall not suffer a Magistrate (if he be a sheep of Christ) to punish Robbers, Adulterers, Murderers: why? for it is against the Nature of true sheep, to persecute any Beasts of the Forrest.

Besides, I demand, whether Paul was a sheep, or a Wolfe, when he smote Elymas with blindness? If he were a Wolfe, how is he then said, to be filled with the Holy Ghost; *Acts* 13. 9. If he were a sheep, why did he strike such a Beast of the Forrest? *ver.* 10, 11.

Furthermore, when the Wolfe runneth ravenously upon the sheep, is it against the nature of the true sheep, to run to their Shephard? And is it then against the Nature of the true Shephard to send forth his Dogs to worry such a Wolfe, without incurring the reproach of a persecutor?

Discusser.

Secondly, if it be a Duty and charge upon all Magistrates in all parts of the world to judge and persecute, in, and for spirituall Causes, then either they are no Magistrates, who are not able to judge in such cases: or else they must judge according to their Consciences, whether Pagan, Turkish, or Antichristian.

Defender.

This hath been againe, and againe Answered above, though it be the Duty of all Magistrates in the world, to judge and punish Blasphemers, Idolaters, and Seducers: yet not *in sensu composito*, whilst they are ignorant of the Truth, and cannot judge of such causes: but *in sensu diviso*, they are bound to be wise, and instructed in the knowledge, and worship of Christ, (*Psal.* 2. 10. 11, 12.) and then to judge accordingly.

But in the meane time, it doth not follow, that they are no Magistrates, who are not able to doe all the Duties of a Magistrate. Neither will it follow, that they must judge according to their Consciences, when their Consciences are blind, and erroneous, Pagan, Turkish, Antichristian. Let them first cast Beames out of their owne eyes, and then they will better discern between Beames, and moles in other men.

Discusser.

Thirdly, the Experience of our Fathers errors, and of our owne mistakes and ignorance, the sense of our owne weaknesses, and blindness in the depths of the Prophecies and mysteries of the Kingdome of Christ,

and the great professed Expectation of the Light to come, which wee are not now able to comprehend, may abate the edge and sheath up the Sword of Persecution against any, especially such as differ not from them in Doctrines of Repentance, or Faith, or Holynesse of heart, and life, but onely in the way, and manner of the Administration of Jesus Christ.

Defender.

I say, as *Augustine* sometime said in another case, *Nunquid negandum quod certum est, quia comprehendere non potest, quod occultum est?* There are depths of sundry Prophecies, which we yet comprehend not: but shall we therefore be alwayes babes, and ignorant of the Fundamentall Principles of Christian Religion? yea and suffer them to be shaken, and ruined, because there are some Prophecies, and Mysteries, which wee yet understand not? Shall the expectation of greater Light so dazle our eyes before wee see it, that we cannot be able to see, what wee doe see? It is not Light, but darknesse, that cloudeth the Light already revealed. Nor is it darknesse onely, but blacknesse of darknesse, that putteth Light for darknesse, and darknesse for Light, and would have both tolerated to live together in the same Hemisphere, because some blinde Christians cannot yet tell, which is whether?

It is true, the Experience of former Errours, and sense of present weaknesse, may justly abate the edge, and sheath up the Sword of persecution against any, that differ onely in errours of weakenesse, and differ not in Doctrines of Faith, Repentance, and Holinesse of heart, and life. Yea wee willingly grant more, then the *Discusser* requireth in such a case. For though there should be some Difference in Doctrines of faith, or Repentance, or Holinesse, Yet wee should not approve the unsheathing of the Sword against such, unlesse the Doctrine were fundamentally subversive to faith, or Repentance, or Holinesse, and that obstinately maintained against light, and conviction: and broached, and dispersed to the Infection, and Seduction of others.

If the Difference be only in the way and manner of Administration of Christ Iesus, and that Difference held forth in a Christian and Peaceable way. God forbid a staffe should be shaken against such, much lesse a Sword unsheathed.

CHAP. 72.

A Reply to his Chap. 75th. Discussing a Testimony of Augustine.

Discussor.

TO begin with Augustine, They murder (saith Hee) Soules, and themselves are afflicted in Body. They put men to everlasting Death, and yet they complaine when themselves are put to a temporall Death.

This Rhetoricall perswasion of humane wisdom seemeth very reasonable in the Eye of flesh, and blood: but one Scripture more prevaieth with faithfull and obedient soules, then thousands of plausible, and Eloquent speeches.

Defender.

Neither this Testimony, nor the rest of those Ancients that follow, were alledged to prevaile with the Faith of any, further then Light of Scripture might shine forth in them: but onely to counterpoise the Testimonies of the Ancients alledged in the Letter against the Truth. And the Discussor in his entrance into this chapter, is forced to acknowledge, that the cause wee maintaine hath more number of Votes (and I may adde, weight of Voters) then the contrary Tenent: onely he putteth it off with this evasion: that Antichrist is too hard for Christ at Votes, and Numbers.

Which yet is the more to be marvelled at, that when the cause is about the Toleration of Hereticks, and Antichristians, that Antichrist should procure more Votes against Antichristians, and Christ to procure any Votes, though fewer for them. And it is but another evasion, whereby he here putteth off *Augustines* speech, as if it were but a Rhetoricall evasion. Whereas indeed the weight of the speech lyeth not in the Rhetorick, which is little, or none: but in the Logick, in an Argument taken from the Excellency of the soule above the body, and thence inferring the equity of killing the bodies of such, as kill the soules of Gods people, and the iniquity of such, as think this unequal.

But to weaken the force of this Argument, the Discussor bestirreth himselfe to draw up fixe Answers.

From

1. From the large extent of soule-killing, which may reach to many sinnes, that are not capitall, 1 Cor. 8. 11.
2. From the dissimilitude of bodily, and spirituall Death. A body being killed can dye but once: but a soule killed may recover.
3. From the different punishment, which Christ hath provided for soule-killers: to wit the two edged Sword, which cometh out of his mouth, which is able to cut downe Heresie, and to kill the soules of Hereticks everlastingly.
4. From the toleration, which Christ himselfe giveth to such soule-killers, or soule-wounders, in the Parable of Tares, Matth. 13.
5. From the impossibility of killing any soule by any Heretick: not the soules of naturall men: for they are dead already: nor can false Teachers so much prevent the meanes of spirituall Life, as doth the force of a materiall Sword, either imprisoning the soules of men in a Nationall-State-Religion: or cutting them off immediately without any longer meanes of Repentance. Nor can there be a killing of the soules of men alive in Christ, partly by reason of the sufficiency and power of Spirituall Ordinances to preserve that Life in them against all Enemies.

Partly, from the Immortality of the spirituall Life in Christ, which can no more dye then Christ himselfe who is alive for ever.

6. From the possibility of a false Teachers, and a Wolves recovery from the Estate of a soule-killer, to become a soule-saver, as it was in the case of Paul.

For a just Reply to all these, let me first premise foure things: and then speake to the Arguments in Order.

1. It is not every murder of the body, that is a capitall crime, but murder executed in some grosse Attempt. For he that hateth his brother is a man-slayer, or murderer (1 Job. 3. 15.) and yet not for that to be put to death.

2. Murder unadvisedly committed, when the Act done was not intended, is not a capitall crime: there were Cities of Refuge provided in such a case, Exod. 21. 13.

3. The very Attempt of murder, in the abuse of an Ordinance of God, is a capitall crime. As in a case, a man shall rise up before a Court of Justice to beare false witnesse against his Neighbour, of some capitall offence, this very attempt of killing his Neighbour by the abuse of publick Justice, is a capitall crime, Deut. 19. 18. to 21.

4. The

4. The murder of the soule is not the onely *Formalis Ratio* (as they call it) the onely proper cause of an Hereticks capitall Crime, but chiefly his bitter roote of Apostacie from God, not onely falling off himsele from God, but seducing others to fall away from him.

These foure things being premised, come wee now to consider of the severall Answers given by the *Discussor* to *Augustines* Argument.

His first Answer reacheth not the point: for as every killing of the body is not a capitall crime, so neither is every killing of the soule, but such as is more voluntary, and presumptuous, and joyned with some grosse and murderous attempt.

His second Answer falleth short in this respect, that though a soule wounded and killed may recover againe, yet the very murderous Attempt of killing a soule, in abusing an Ordinance of God, in corrupting Religion, is a capitall crime, whether the soule dye of that wound or no: or if it dye whether it be recovered, or no. *Thine eye shall not spare him, because he hath sought to thrust thee away from the Lord thy God, Deut 13. 10. Though hee did not thrust thee away, yet because he sought to doe it hee shall dye.*

His third Answer hath been removed above. Church-censures are sufficient to heale the Heretick, if he belong to God, and to remove the guilt of his wickednesse from the Church: but not sufficient, to prevent his further spreading of the Leaven of his corruption: nor sufficient to cleanse the Common-wealth from the guilt of such Rebellion, as hath been taught by him against the Lord.

His fourth Answer taken from Christs toleration of the Tares hath been largely, and (as I conceive) fully refuted above.

His fifth Answer hath also been cleared already. If the Answer were good, it would evacuate not onely *Augustines* Argument, but *Pauls* also, 1 Cor 8. 11. *Paul* dissuadeth from eating things sacrificed to Idols in Idols Temples. The Argument to dissuade it, is from the offence thereby given to the Conscience of the weak: and that backed and strengthened from the baynousnesse of the sinne of offence to Conscience: It is the murder, or perishing of a weak Brotheres soule. Now if this Answer of the *Discussor*

suffer might stand, it would make the Argument of the Apostle of none effect. For either this weake Brother is a *naturall man*, dead in sinne already, and *then no man can kill him*: or else he is in Christ, and then his Life is immortall, and Christ hath provided Ordinances powerfully sufficient to prevent or heale such deadly Dangers.

It is an high presumptuous tempting of God, and wanton treading under foote the precious soules of men for whom Christ dyed, to wound and (as much as in us lyeth) to kill the soules of men, upon pretence, the Lord can save them, and raise them againe by his all-sufficient Grace. It is a putting of feare, where none is, that the punishment of obstinate seducing *Hereticks with the materiall Sword, is the imprisoning of the soules of men to a Nationall Religion*: for if the Religion of the Nation be good, it is no Imprisonment: if naught, there should be no punishment. And it is a like causlesse Feare, that, the cutting off of Hereticks, *will cut off men immediately without any longer meanes of Repentance*: for if they belong to God, God will give them Repentance before they goe hence: but whether they belong to God, or no, the revealed will of God is fulfilled in their just Execution.

The last Answer falleth as short of strength, as any of the former. For if men be such Wolves, and Blasphemers as *Paul* was, before his Conversion, neither the Law of God or man would put such an one to Death, who sinned of ignorance, and walked (as himselfe professeth) with all good Conscience, even in his former evill times, *Acts 23. 1.* But as for such as Apostate from the known Truth of Religion, and seeke to subvert the Foundation of it, and to draw away others from it, to plead for their Toleration in hope of their Conversion, is as much as to proclaime a generall pardon for all malefactors, (save such onely as sinne against the Holy Ghost:) for he that is a wilfull murderer, and Adulterer now, may come to be converted and dye a martyr hereafter.

C H A P. 73. A Reply to his Chap. 76.
discussing the Testimony of Optatus.

Discusser.

THe Answerer alledgeth from Optatus his third Booke, that he justified Macarius, who had put some Hereticks to death, for that he had done no more herein, then what Moses, Phineas, and Elias had done before him.

But these are shafts usually drawn from the Quiver of the Ceremoniall and Typicall State of the Nationall Church of the Jewes, which vanished at the appearing of the Body, and substance of the Sun of Righteousnesse, who set up another Kingdome, or Church (Heb. 12.) Ministry, and Worship: In which wee finde no such Ordinance, Precept, or Precedent of killing men for Religion sake.

Defender.

Whether these shafts be taken from the Quiver of the Ceremoniall and Typicall State of the Nationall Church of the Jewes, or no: Sure this Answer is taken from no Law of God, nor any Scripture ground: but from the Topicks of humane invention.

Did ever any Apostle or Evangelist make the judiciall Lawes of Moses concerning life and death, Ceremoniall, or Typicall? Time was, when humane inventions in Gods Worship, were accounted Superstition: but now humane inventions in Doctrine, may passe for current Evangelicall Divinity.

It is true the Sonne of Righteousnesse hath set up another Church, Ministry, and Worship: But did he ever set up another civill Righteousnesse? or a Magistracy to walke by another rule of Righteousnesse, then that which God gave by Moses? If it be true, that Christ gave no expresse Ordinance, Precept, or Precedent of killing men by materiall Swords for Religion sake: It is as true that neither did he for any breach of civill Justice, nor for murder, nor adultery. Which maketh it therefore evident, that seeing he hath expressely authorized civill Magistracy in the New-Testament, and hath given no expresse Lawes or Rules of Righteousnesse for them to walke by in Administration of civil Justice, therefore either he leaveth them to act and rule without

a Rule (which derogateth from the perfection of Scripture;) or else they must fetch their rules of Righteousnesse from the Law of *Moses*, and from the Prophets, who have expounded him in the Old-Testament.

Discusser.

More particularly, concerning Moses, I Querie what Commandment, or practise of Moses, either Optatus, or the Answerer here intended. Probably that of Moses, Deut. 13. If so I shall particularly Reply to that, in Answer to the reasons here under mentioned.

Defender.

When *Optatus* speaketh, that *Masarius* in putting Hereticks to death had done no more, then *Moses* had done before him: he appeareth he meant not that passage of *Deut. 13.* but of *Exod. 32.* where he put to death Idolaters: and that of *Levit. 24.* where he put the Blasphemer to death. For *Optatus* speaketh of what *Moses* had done, not what *Moses* had commanded to be done. But I shall (God willing) consider his Answer, if it come in my way.

Discusser.

Concerning Phinehas his zealous Act.

1. *His slaying the Israelitish man and woman of Midian, was not for spirituall, but corporall filthynesse.*

Defender.

Was it for bodily or corporall filthynesse? Surely for spiritual. For the *Israelites* that committed whoredome with the daughters of the Land, they were invited to the Sacrifices of their God: And being invited they did eat and bowed downe to their Gods, and so joyned themselves to *Baal Peor*: this is plaine in the text *Numb. 25. 1, 2, 3.*

Now I doe not know, that corporall filthynesse betwene a young man and single woman was any Capitall Crime, by the Law of *Moses*. But the Discusser contenteth himself, if any thing be said, it may goe for an Answer.

Discusser.

2. *No man will produce this fact as Precedentiall to any Minister of the Gospel, so to act in any Civill State &c.*

Defender.

Defender.

It is true, it is no Precedent for Ministers: but the fact so clearly acknowledged, and approved, and rewarded of God, is doubtlesse an act of righteousness to have been done by some in their ordinary calling (to wit, by *Moses* and the Princes of *Israel* :) which *Phinehas* did by an extraordinary motion. God is not wont to approve any act of holynesse, or righteousness (though never so extraordinary) which doeth not fall under the ordinary Rule of holynesse, and righteousness, in the ordinary calling of some or other Function, which himselfe hath ordained. Therefore though *Phinehas* his fact be no Precedent for Ministers of the Gospel; yet it is Precedentiall to such as beare not the Sword in vaine, but for the punishment of evill doers.

Discusser.

Concerning *Elijah*, There were two famous acts of *Elijah* of a killing nature.

1. That of slaying 850. of Baals Prophets, 1 Kings. 18.
2. Of the two Captaines, and their fifties by Fyre.

For the first, It cannot figure or Type out any materiall slaughter of the many thousands of false Prophets in the world by any materiall Sword of Iron, or Steele: for as that passage was miraculous: so wee finde not any such Commission given by the Lord *Jesus* to the Ministers of the Gospel.

Defender.

It will doe the Discusser no hurt to take notice, that he that is forward to take hold of any slip of Pen, or memory, is subject to the like slips himself. The number of the false Prophets, which he saith, were slayne by *Elijah* exceedeth the Truth by halfe in halfe: the Text numbrell them 450. and he numbrell them 850. Againe, it is a vaine thing to inquire what this fact of *Elijah* should figure or Type out. Acts of Morall Justice, though they may sometimes be extraordinary: yet they are never accounted Typicall, or Figurative: but by such as would transforme all the Scripture into an Allegory.

Besides, why should he call the fact Miraculous? Is it a miracle for *Elijah* with the aide of so many thousand people of *Israel* to put to death 450. men, whose spirits were discouraged being convinced of their forgery and Idolatry?

Moreover, Though Christ gave no such Commission to Ministers of the Gospel to put false Prophets to death, as *Elijah* did: yet the same Answer holdeth here which was given to the fact of *Phineas*: though the hand which executed Justice was extraordinary: yet the act of Justice, was an ordinary duty of Morall Righteousnesse, belonging to such as beare the Sword.

Discusser.

Lastly, such a slaughter must not onely extend to all the false Prophets in the world, but (according to the Answerers grounds) to the many thousands of thousands of Idolaters, and false worshippers in the Kingdomes and Nations of the world:

Defender.

Such a slaughter being onely made of the false Prophets in *Israel* (a people in Covenant with the true and living God) the example of it will onely extend to the like execution of all the false Prophets in the Church of God, who have turned the hearts of the People of God from *Jehovah* to an Idol. What hath any Officer in the Church, or Magistrate in the Common-wealth to doe, to censure or punish all the false Prophets in the world, when many hundreds of them (if not thousands) are exempt from their jurisdiction? muchlesse will this example extend to the slaughter of many thousands of thousands of Idolaters, and false worshippers in the Kingdomes and Nations of the world.

For 1. many thousand thousands of them are exempt from the civill Magistracy of Christians.

2. They were never in Covenant with God to whom onely the Law of *Moses* (concerning the punishment of Idolaters) extendeth.

3. Though the *Israelites* were Idolaters, yet *Elijah* spared them, as having bin lead aside from the dayes of their Fathers, in their simplicity, and Ignorance, by these false Teachers. And for sins of Ignorance God hath appointed other expiatory Sacrifices, then the slaughter of the offenders. Nor hath the Answerer any grounds, or thoughts to the contrary.

As for the other fact of *Elijah* in slaying the Captaines of their fifties, as it is not pertinent to the punishment of false Prophets, nor of Idolaters (as such :) so I doe not finde it alledged by any in this cause, but only by the Discusser, to make himself worke.

But

But when the *Discusser* is pleased to glory in his Answers to *Augustine*, before, and to *Optatus* here, That if *Augustine* were now living, he would be of his minde, and *Optatus*, and the Answerer himselfe might rest satisfied.

Let the *Discusser* revise againe what he hath written, and see if he can satisfie himselfe (muchlesse the Answerer, and least of all *Augustine*, and *Optatus*) in such Cobweb Evasions.

CHAP. 74. A Reply to his Chap. 77.

Discusser.

As for *Calvine*, *Beza*, and *Aretius*, mine Answer is, since matter of fact and opinion are barely related by the Answerer without their grounds, (whose grounds notwithstanding, in this Booke are Answered) If *Paul* himselfe were joyned with them, yea or an Angel from Heaven, bringing any other Rule, then what the Lord *Jesus* hath once delivered, wee have *Pauls* Conclusion, and Resolution, preptory, and dreadfull, *Gal. 1. 8.*

Defender.

That I onely quoted the Names of those blessed men of God, it was partly because it was enough to counterpoise the Names of Authors alledged by the Letter against the Truth, by the Names of greater and more holy men of God, for the Truth: partly also, because if I had quoted their grounds, I must have transcribed their whole Bookes of the Argument. *Calvines* discourse about it, against *Servetus*, is bound up in his *Opuscula*. *Bezias* his Booke de *Hæresibus a Magistratu puniendis*, is bound up also in his *Opuscula*: but both of them too large by me to be copied, and too strong and accurate, by them of the adverse part to be refuted. *Aretius*, a like solid writer, may sooner be shifted off, then sifted to Branne. But it seemeth, if *Paul* himselfe had joyned with them in the like fulnesse of expressions, himselfe should rather have been accursed by the *Discusser*, then his Doctrine accepted. Which seemeth to me a strange both prejudice, and presidence met together. For since God layd this charge upon Magistrates in the Old-Testament, to punish Seducers, & the Lord *Jesus* never tooke this charge off in the New-Testament;

Testament, who is this *Discusser*, that he should account Paul himselfe, or an Angell from Heaven accursed, that should leave this charge till upon Magistrates, which God layed on, and Christ never tooke off? That Argument from the Parable Let both grow together to the Harvest is not at all expounded in the Interpretation, Let Seducers be suffered to live in the world till the last Judgement. And how weake a Foundation that is, to cast a curse upon a chosen Apostle, or upon an holy Angel, I hope hath been cleared in discussing that Text.

Discusser.

Let me finish the whole, by proposing one Conclusion of the Author of the arguments in the Letter, viz. It is no prejudice to the Commonwealth, if Liberty of Conscience were suffered to such, as feare God indeed.

Abraham abode a long time amongst the Canaanites: though contrary to them in Religion &c. So did Isaac: so did Jacob twentie yeares with his Uncle Laban.

So the People of Israel were about foure and thirty yeares in Egypt: and afterwards seventie in Babylon, differing from Religion in both States.

Come to the time of Christ, Israel lived under the Romans, and divers Sects in Israel, besides Christ, and his Apostles &c. All these lived under Cæsars Government, being nothing hurtfull to the Commonwealth, giving to Cæsar, that which was his. And for their Religion, he left them to themselves, as having no Dominion over their soules and Consciences. And when the enemies of the Truth raised up any tumults, the wisdom of the Magistrates most wisely appeased them, Acts 18. 14. and 19. 35. Unto this, the Answerer returneth thus much:

It is true, That without prejudice to the Commonwealth, Liberty of Conscience may be suffered to such as feare God indeed: as knowing they will not persist in Heresie, or turbulent Schisme, when they are convinced in Conscience of the sinfulness thereof.

But the Question is whether an Heretick after once or twice Admonition (and so after conviction) or any other scandalous and beynd Offender, may be Tolerated either in the Church without Excommunication: or in the Commonwealth without such punishment, as may preserve others from dangerous and damnable infection.

C H A P. 75. A Reply to his Chap. 78.

Discusser.

BUt here I observe the Answerers partiality, That none but such as truly feare God should enjoy Liberty of Conscience &c.

Defender.

But here I Observe the Discussers both partiality and falshood. Partiality, for I did but repeate the very words of the Author of the Letter, and graunt them to be good. The Letter had said (as himself repeateth it, *It is no prejudice to a Common-wealsh if Liberty of Conscience were suffered to such as feare God indeed: where to I subjoyne my Attestation, It is true, that without prejudice to the Common-wealth, Liberty of Conscience may be suffered to men that feare God indeed.*

Here the Discusser in me observeth Partiality: but in the Letter the very same speech passeth for Currant, and approveable. But the Lord helpe him to remember *Divers weights, and divers measures are abomination to the Lord, Prov. 20. 10.* But I truly observe in his speech, not onely partiality, but falshood also. For it is a very fa'lhoo, that I should say, *None but such as truly feare God should injoy Liberty of Conscience.* I say no more then the Letter saith: It saith, *That it is no prejudice to the Common-wealsh, if Liberty of Conscience were suffered to such as feare God indeed.* I say, *It is true, without prejudice to the Common-wealth, Liberty of Conscience may be suffered to such as feare God indeed.* Now if a man should gather the same Observation out of the Letter, *That none but such as truly feare God should injoy Liberty of Conscience,* I beleive the Discusser would observe notorious falshood in such dealing. And justly he might: for it is one thing to say, liberty of Conscience may be suffered to men that truly feare God, without prejudice to the Common-wealth: another thing to say, it may be suffered to none else.

I easily grant, nor did I ever deny it, that the Inhabitants of the world, though they never come into the estate of men fearing God, yet they may and ought to be suffered to live in the world,

world, unless they disturbe the Countries of the world where they live, with some Capitall Crimes. And if they doe disturbe the Countries where they live, they stand and fall to the Lawes, and Governments of the Countries where they inhabite.

And therefore all the dangerous consequences, which the *Dis-
cussor* gathereth from my speech (but indeed not my speech, but his owne) as if I should drive the world out of the world, or turne the world upside downe, or leave it to men that have not Gods feare, to judge who feare God, and who not, and the rest that follow, they are all of them consequences without an Antecedent, or an Antecedent without existence in any speech of mine, but onely in his owne imagination.

Neither hath it any better ground, that passionate exclamation of his, with which he endeth this Chapter.

Hearre (saith he) O Heavens, and give eare O Earth, yea let the Heavens be astonish'd, and the Earth tremble at such an Answer.

What Answer, thinke you, might this be, that might provoke not the *Dis-
cussor* onely, but the Heavens and earth to such attention, admiration, trembling, astonishment?

The Answer (forsooth) is that which he calleth a wonderfull Answer, which the Ministers of New-England gave to the third Question sent to them by some Ministers of Old-England, to wit, that although they confessed them to be such persons whom they approved of, farre above themselves, yea who were in their hearts to live and die together: yet if they or other godly people with them, coming over to them, should differ in Church-Constitution, they then could not approve their civill Co-habitation with them and consequently could not advise their Magistrates, to suffer them to enjoy a civill being within their jurisdiction.

Now sure, if there were any such Answer to be found in that Booke sounding to such a purpose, I my selfe should joyne with him in the like exclamation, and wonderment. But when I came to search for that speech, and neither finde it in the Answer which he quoteth to the third Question, nor in that, which I rather thinke he meant, the 31. I cannot but admire and adore the righteous Judgement of God, who having left the *Dis-
cussor* (in this Booke, and some other) to write against the Truth in points of Doctrine, hath herein left him to breake forth in his owne hand.

hand-writing, into notorious impudent falshood in matter of fact: which any man that readeth that Booke cannot but discern in this Allegation. The Answer is too large for me to transcribe, but who so will may read it, and when he compareth the Answer in that Booke, with the Answer in this, he may well wonder with what heart and forehead, the *Disseuer* could so expresse it.

CHAP. 76. A Reply to his 79. Chap.

Disseuer.

Yea, but say they, they doubt not if those Ministers of Old-England should come over to them, and were here with them, they should agree. For, say they, either you will come to us, or shew us light to come to you: for wee are but weak men, and dreame not of perfection in this life.

Alas who knoweth not what lamentable differences have been betwene the same Ministers of the Church of England? &c.

Let none now thinke, that the passage to New-England by Sea, or the nature of the Countrie can doe, what onely the Key of David can doe, to wit, open and shut the Consciences of men.

Defender.

I did not thinke that any man in Old-England, or New, had been so ignorant, or uncharitable, as to thinke, the Pen-man of the Answer to these Questions had conceived, that either the voyage by Sea, or the change of the aire from Old-England to New, could change the judgements or Consciences of men. Nature could tell, *Cælum, non animum mutant, qui trans mare Currunt.* But yet no Christian man is ignorant that mutual conference between Godly, ingenuous, and selfe-denying Christians is a notable meanes sanctified of God for the instruction & edification one of another, till wee all come to be of one minde in the Lord. Else how shall there be mutuall convictions without mutuall conferences? It is the Key of David onely, that can open and shut the Consciences of men: but that Key ordinarily doth it in the dispensation of Ordinances, whereof Conference is one.

B b

Disseuer.

Discusser.

Besides, how can this be a faithfull and upright acknowledgement of their weaknesse, and imperfection, when they Preach, Print, and practise such violence to the soules and bodies of others? And by their Rules and grounds ought to proceed to the killing of those, whom they judge so deare unto them, and in respect of godlynesse farre above themselves?

Defender.

This violence to the soules & bodies of men is often charged upon us by the *Discusser*: But he hath not yet given us an instance of any one soule or body, which hath undergone this violence from us. *Si Accusasse sufficiat, quis innocens exit?* It is no new practise to be an Accuser of the Brethren: neither is their any slander so false or scurilous, but findeth ready, yea and greedy intertainment even of many professors, especially such, whose best Religion lyeth in the observing and censuring the wayes of others. How welcome to such, are evill reports of them, that dare not allow themselves in any knowne evill?

This acknowledgement of our weaknesse and imperfection would then truly appeare to be neither faithfull nor upright, if wee Preached or practised violence against such, in comparison of whom we acknowledge our own weaknesse and imperfection. *Meane while we may well stand and wonder, what rules and Grounds of ours those be, by which wee ought to proceed even to the killing of those, whom wee judge so deare unto us, and in respect of Godlynesse far above us?*

Are any of them whom wee so respect, such as subvert the Foundation of the Christian Faith, and persist therein obstinately after conviction? are any of them presumptuous Blasphemers of the great Name of God? Or Idolaters themselves, and Seducers of others to Idolatry?

CHAP. 77. A Reply to his Chap. 80.

Discusser.

What though, they say, the Godly will not persist in Heresie, or turbulent Schisme, when they are convinced thereof in Conscience? If the civill Court and Magistrates must judge, and those civill Courts, are as lawfull, consisting of naturall men, as of Godly persons, then what consequences will follow, I have before mentioned.

Defender.

Mentioned, indeed, but not proved: I hope (by the helpe of Christ) the inconsequence of them hath been cleared.

Discusser.

And I adde, according to this Conclusion it must follow, that if the most godly persons yeeld not to once or twice Admonition (as is maintained by the Answerer) they must necessarily be esteemed obstinate persons: for if they were godly, they would yeeld.

Defender.

Here againe the Discusser misreporteth my words: For I did not say, that if persons be godly, they would yeeld to once or twice Admonition: and if they did not yeeld to once or twice Admonition, they must necessarily be esteemed obstinate persons. But my words were, *The godly will not persist in Heresie or turbulent Schisme, when they are convinced in Conscience of the sinfulness thereof.*

Here is then a three-fold wresting of my words, & accordingly so much false dealing. For 1. Admonition is one thing: Conviction in their owne Conscience, is another. For though Admonition ought not to be dispensed till after conviction: yet it may fall out, that the Church (through mistake) proceedeth to Admonition, before the Offender be convinced in his own Conscience of the sinfulness of his way.

2. He carrieth my words, as if they who yeeld not to once or twice Admonition must needs be esteemed obstinate persons: whereas I onely say, they will not persist in Heresie, (that is, in obstinacy of Fundamentall Error) nor in turbulent Schisme, when they are convinced in Conscience of the sinfulness thereof.

3. He propoundeth my words generally, as if I had said that godly persons (in whatsoever Error they hold) if they yeeld not to once or twice Admonition, they must needs be esteemed obstinate. whereas I spake not of every Error, but of persisting in Heresie and turbulent Schisme.

But you may see how farre the love of an Error, and desire of contention, will transport the minde and spirit!

The two stories that he telleth, upon this occasion (in his next words) because he nameth neither time, nor persons, nor occasions of the speeches (which he representeth as odious) a short Answer will serve to them. 1. I have too much experience of the *Discessers* mistakes of permanent Printed words, and therefore am affraid to credit every report of transient words spoken, without further Testimony. 2. The words might be spoken by some persons, concerning others, upon such occasions, as I will by no meanes excuse, or justifie: but they might be spoken upon such weightes, as might justly hold weight in the Ballance of the Sanctuary.

The latter part of my Answer which he saith, cometh not neere the Question, I now understand so much by the *Discesser*: but it did not so appeare to me by the Author of the Letter.

Discesser.

Mr. Cotton concludeth with a confident perswasion, of having removed the grounds of that great Error, viz. that persons are not to be persecuted for cause of Conscience.

Defender.

How hard a thing is it, to write against the Truth, and yet to speake with a lip of Truth? Compare the words of my conclusion with the *Discessers* relation or representation thereof. The words of my conclusion were these

Thus much I thought needfull to be spoken for the avoyding of the grounds of your Error.

1. Then, let him speake, what words of mine doe expresse the confidence of my perswasion? It is true, I believe, and therefore speake what I have written: but wherein did I blow up my be- liefe to a confident perswasion? I thank God: I doubt not of the truth of what I have writtten: but it is one thing, what I conceive in my minde: another thing what I thinke meet to expresse.

2. I

2. I doe not say in this conclusion, that I have removed the grounds of his Error : but that I have spoken so much for that end : but whether I have done it or no (according to the helpe of Christ received) I leave others to judge.

3. The name of a great Error is foisted in by himselfe, *ad exaggerandam gloriationis invidiam et indignitatem* : but though the Error be indeed great : yet I did not so stile it, when I spake of mine owne endeavour to remove the grounds of it.

4. It is an evident falshood that I should conclude, *This to be that great Error, That persons are not to be persecuted for cause of Conscience.*

For it is that which in stating the Question, I did in expresse termes deny, that any was to be persecuted for cause of Conscience: no not an Heretick, no not in a Church-way, much lesse in a civill way till being convinced in his owne Conscience of his wickednesse, he do stand out therein, not only against the Truth, but against the light of his owne Conscience, that so it may appeare, he is not persecuted for cause of Conscience, but punished for sinning against his Conscience.

Onely this, I now further adde, which I know not, whether I had not occasion to speake to in this Discourse hitherto (unlesse in a touch) that sometime it may be an aggravation of sinne both in judgement and practise, that a man holdeth it, or committeth it in Conscience. But that is onely in case, when a man hath been wonted to sin so oft against his light, and against the cleare Principles of Truth, and godlinesse, that it may appeare, the just curse of God hath given him up to a reprobate-blinded minde, and seared Conscience. But of that wee have not had occasion to dispute in this Discourse.

Discusser.

But I beleive it shall appeare, That the charge of Error Reboundeth backe, even such an Error as may be called the Bloudy-Tenent.

Defender.

I hope, It hath by this time appeared, in the former dispute, (through the blessing of Christ) That, that which he calleth the *Bloudy-Tenent* is washed white in the blood of the Lambe : and tendeth both to the ends, for which the Prince of peace dyed, viz. To the saving of his sheep from devouring to the dissolving of

of the cursed works of Satan, to the maintenance of his Truth, and to the preservation of sacred and civill peace, both in Churches, and Common-wealth.

C H A P. 78. *A Reply to his Chap. 81.*

Defender.

TO the last Chapter of the *Discusser*, I thinke it not worth the while to speake any thing: it consisting cheifly of the *Discussers* selfe-applauses and vaine-glorious Triumphs; As that he knoweth, *That the God, the Spirit, and Prince, the Angells of peace, and that all the true awaked sonnes of peace will call the Truth (be it with this Doctrine of Toleration held for it by himselfe) blessed:*

That the contemplations thereof are sweet and precious: but Oh how sweet the actions, and Fruitions!

That these lips of Truth (so wit, distilling in his Pen) drop as the honey Combe: Honey and milke are under her Tongue: and oh that these drops, these streames might flow without interruption?

Onely one passage of his glorious boasting, I may not let passe, without some Animadversion because the Name of Christ is interested in it, and dishonoured by it.

Discusser.

Were I (saith he) beleived in this, That Christ is not delighted with the blood of men, (but shed his owne blood for his bloudest enemies:) *That by the word of Christ, No man for gainsaying Christ, or joyning with his enemy Antichrist, should be molested with the Civill sword: were this foundation laid, and the Magna Charta of highest Liberties, and good security given on all hands for the preservation of it, How soone would every Brow and House be stuck with Olive Branches?*

Whether this be not to Conclude with confident perswasion (the same, and farre greater then that which he noted in me, even now) I matter not. Let him reserve conclusions with confident perswasions to himselfe alone. Had he ground (from the eternall word of Truth) for such confidence, It would never trouble me, nor hurt him,

But this is not, pleasing to Christ, nor to the Spirit of his wisdom: and Truth, that the *Dissonner* should publish the delights of Christ in a confussed way, without distinguishing things that differ, and so not dividing the Word aright. *It is true, that Christ delighteth not in the blood of men, but shed his owne for his bloudest enemies, and gainsayers: to wit, whilst they gain saying him, and bloudily persecute him, or his out of ignorance. In this case indeed, he prayeth for them, and dieth for them, Father forgive them, they know not what they doe, Luk. 23. 34. whilst wee were enemies Christ died for us, Rom 5. 8, 10.*

But to say that Christ delighteth not in the blood of wen, who after the acknowledgement of his Truth doe tread the blood of his Covenant under foote, and wittingly and willingly reject him from reigning over them: To hold it forth, that Christ delighteth not in the blood of such men, or that he would not have such molested by the civill Sword, who gain say Christ known and professed, and joyn with his enemy Antichrist, in blaspheming and persecuting Christ and his Saints, This the *Dissonner* can never make good to be the word of Christ. It is indeed, to publish the glad Tidings of the Gospel, not to the humble and meeke *Lambes* of Christ, but to the seed of the Serpent, to sow pillowes under all elbowes: to make the hearts of the righteous sad, whom God would not make sad: and to strengthen the hands of the wicked in their Apostacy from the truth, and malignity against it. Christ hath pronounced it upon earth, and ratified it in Heaven, *Those mine enemies, that would not that I should reigne over them, bring them hither and slay them before my face, Luk. 19. 27.* Are these the words of him, that delighteth not in the blood of his bloudest enemies, and gainsayers? when the Lord Jesus sendeth forth his servants to powre out bloody vengeance upon Antichristian emissaries, and openeth the hearts & mouthes of his Saints to praise him for thus judging (*Rev. 16. 4, 7*) Is this to proclaime a *Magna Charta* of highest libertyes, even to his gainsayers, and to such as joyn with his enemy Antichrist?

Time was, when *Jebu* justly demanded, *What peace (what hast thou to doe with peace) so long as the whoredomes of thy Mother Jezabel, and her witchcrafts are so many? 2 Kings, 9. 22.* And are the times now so farre changed, that the Sword of *Jebu* shall proclaime peace.

It is therefore lesse marvell, that in Answer to the perface of the Modell, he breaketh forth into such vast hyperboles, That the Modell awakened Moses from his outrageous Grave: and desired Jesus yet to have seen the earth. A speech as devoid of reason, as of truth. The observation of Moses Lawes doth not awaken Moses out of his grave, nor is there any reason it should. The validity of Lawes doth not (in reason) depend upon the life or resurrection of the Lawgiver: the Examiner himselfe (I suppose) would not doubt, but the Lawes of Moses were of force to the dwellers in the Land of Canaan, when yet Moses was dead and buried before their entrance into the Land. Neither did their observation of them awaken Moses out of his grave, but argued his Lawes to be in force as well after his death, as whilst he was yet living. If it be said, That Christ at his coming in the flesh when he was buried himselfe, buried also the Lawes of Moses with him in his grave.

Then the Examiner should not have said, that the Modell raised up Moses out of his grave, but that it raised up Christ out of his

grave. But he said againe, the Examiner said, A denied Christ to have seen the earth, which was of as ill consequence. Be it so: but yet still, this maketh nothing to the raising up of Moses out of his grave.

I Answer further, Neither doth it at all deny, Christ to have seen the earth. For Christ came not to destroy the Lawe of Moses, Mat. 5. 17. Neither the Morall Lawe, for in the sequels of that Chapter, he doth at large expound it, and establish it.

No, nor did he come to destroy the judicall Lawes, such as them as are of Morall equity. Or else, the Conscience of the civil Magistrate could never doe any act of civill justice, out of fear, because he should have no word of God to be the ground of his action, if the Lawes of judgement in the Old Testament were abrogated, and none extant in the New. As further exception, which the Examiner taketh against the Preface. It is as easily avoided, as Objected.

If (saith he) the civil Magistrate (even the highest) being a Member of the Church, be subject to Church Discipline, how can he be so with the common Town, that he must keep the Fifth Table, Refrain the

Church, be Judge and Governor in all causes, as well ecclesiasticall as Civill?

Secondly, how can a Magistrate both sit on the Bench, and stand at the Bar of Christ Jesus? Is it not as impossible, as to reconcile east and west together? Yea, is not the Text in Isa. 49, 23. Lamentably wrested to prove both these?

Reply.

One Answer may easily remove both Exceptions: And that one Text doth expressly hold forth both these Points, which the Examiner conceiveth to be so irreconcilable.

For if Princes be nursing Fathers to the Church (as that Text speaketh) then they are to provide, that the children of the Church be not nursed with poison in stead of milke. And in so doing, they keepe the first Table. *Reforme the Church, & judge in causes Ecclesiasticall,*

Againe, If the the same Princes shall bow down to the Church with their faces towards the earth, and lick the dust of her feet (as the same Text expresseth) then they being members of the Church, shall be subject also to Church-Censure. In one word Princes sit on the Bench over the Church in the offensive Government of the Church: & yet may themselves (being members of the Church) be subject to Church-Censure in the offensive Government of themselves against the Rules of the Gospel.

The Examiner himselfe confesseth, that in severall respects, *He that is a governor, may be also a Subject.*

Behold here are severall respects, to wit, severall objects of Judicature; In the Mal-Administration of the Church, the Magistrate sitteth as Judge, and Governor: in the Mal-Administration of a Church-Member Magistrate contrary to the expresse rules of the Gospel, he is subject to the power of Christ in the Church. If it be said, may rather, The Church is subject to the Magistrate in civill causes: and the Magistrate is subject to the Church in spiritual causes:

I Answer, That easeth not the difficulty, no more then the other. For suppose the Magistrate (a Church member) live in Incest, breake forth into murder, and notorious oppression: these are all civill causes, belonging to the second Table. If the Magistrate sit as Judge and supreme Governor in this case, then must

the Church tolerate him herein, to the dishonour of the great Name of Christ, to the leavening of the Church, and to the perdition of his soule. If it be granted; that in such a case though civill, the Church is bound to deale faithfully with the Magistrate, and not to suffer sinne upon him: let the like power be granted to the Magistrate to deale faithfully with the Church in the notorious transgressions of the first Table, as is granted to the Church to deale with the Magistrate in the notorious transgressions of the second Table, and the controversie is ended.

If any further matter be claimed in making the Supreme Magistrate, the Supreme Judge and Governor in all causes, as well Ecclesiasticall, as civill, I doe not understand, that the Ministers or Churches of Christ are called to acknowledge such a meaning. Sure I am, the Interpretation of that high stile, which godly learned *Reynolds* made of it in the 10. Chap. of his Conference with *Hart*, It was accepted of the State in the dayes of *Queene Elizabeth*. And the same Interpretation (if no more be intended by that stile) doth well stand with our defence.

But wherefore doe I put my Sicle into the Harvest of my Brethren? my Brethren, who penned that Modell, are richly furnished by Christ with ability to defend it. I therefore leave it to them, whom it cheifly concerneth, to maintaine the Truth, which themselves have witnessed in that Modell.

And the Lord Jesus Christ himself (the God of Truth) who came into the world, that he might beare witnesse to the Truth, be pleased to beare witnesse from Heaven to his owne Truth and blast that peace (a fraudulent and false peace) which the Examiner proclaimeth to all the wayes of falshood in Religion, to Heresie in Doctrine, to Idolatry in worship, to blasphemy of the great Name of God, to Pollution, and prophanation of all his holy Ordinances.

Amen, Even So, Come Lord Jesus.

A R E P L Y.